

JPRS-TAC-86-079

3 OCTOBER 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

3 OCTOBER 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Japan's Cabinet Ministers Discuss SDI Participation (Tokyo KYODO, 2 Sep 86).....	1
Japan Government Announces SDI Participation (Tokyo KYODO, 9 Sep 86).....	2
Kuranari Informs U.S:	2
Talks To Begin Soon	2
MITI To Set SDI Guidelines	3
Kuranari Questioned in Diet	4
Japan's Foreign Minister on SDI, Ties With USSR, PRC (Tokyo KYODO, 30 Aug 86).....	5
Japan's High-Tech Firms Supportive of SDI Decision (Tokyo KYODO, 9 Sep 86).....	7
Briefs	
Japan Opposition Parties Denounce SDI Decision	8
Italy's SDI Participation	8

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

FRG Paper Says 1986 Summit Will Produce No Arms Agreement (Jan Reifenberg; Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG, 5 Sep 86).....	9
--	---

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Netherlands Defense Minister Opposed to More Nuclear Deployments (Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT, 29 Aug 86).....	12
---	----

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Soviet Academician Fokin on Threat From U.S. Binary Weapons (A. Fokin; Moscow SOVETSKIY VOIN, No 10, May 86).....	13
--	----

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

Zimbabwe's NAM Summit Policy Statement on European Arms Control (Belgrade TANJUG, 7 Sep 86).....	18
---	----

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

Moscow Radio Broadcast of 25 August Press Conference (Moscow Domestic Service, 25 Aug 86).....	19
USSR: Comments on Moratorium 3-16 September (Various sources, various dates).....	27
Hammer, Gale Cited	27
U.S. Propaganda 'Attack', by Spartak Beglov	28
Urgency Stressed, by Yuriy Bandura, Yuriy Buksin	29
U.S. 'Cave Mentality', by Vladimir Katin	34
Scientist Outlines Benefits, by Aleksandr Kalyadin	36
Finnish Politician Cited	39
'Disarmament Tango' Urged, by Leonid Ponomarev	40
'Lack of Political Will', by G. Dadyants	41
'Breakthrough Seen Possible', by Ye. Primakov	44
Weinberger View 'Absurd', by V. Gan	47
Defense Ministry Expert, V. L. Kotyuzhanskiy Interview	48
World Opinion Cited, by Vsevolod Ovchinnikov	51
'Daniloff Affair' Distracts From Offer, by Aleksandr Zholkver	53
U.S. Arguments Rebutted, by Vasilii Morozov	53
Moscow Radio Talk Show, by Vyacheslav Lavrentyev, et. al.	55
Foreign Journalists Round Table, by Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, et. al.	57
Message to AFL-CIO	59
Summit Prospects 'Not Rosy', by Nikolay Shishlin	60
Defense Ministry Spokesman, A. F. Kuznetsov Interview	61
U.S. 'Politicking' Hit, by V. Falin	63
Soviet Army Paper Hits FRG's Woerner Remarks on Moratorium (I. Voinov; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 3 Sep 86).....	67
USSR: Kazakhstan Experiment Shows Moratorium Verifiable (A. Borovik; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 13 Sep 86).....	69
USSR's Petrosyants Holds Geneva Press Conference on Moratorium (Moscow TASS, 15 Sep 86).....	73

Gorbachev Fields Questions on Test Moratorium (Moscow Television Service, 17 Sep 86; Moscow Domestic Service, 18 Sep 86).....	74
17 September	74
18 September	75
TASS Cites U.S. Peace Group on Testing Program (Moscow TASS, 8, 10 Sep 86).....	77
4 Sep Test Information	77
Upcoming Tests	77
IZVESTIYA Observer's Comments	78
Moscow TV: 2 Sep Press Conference on Verification Techniques (Moscow Television Service, 2 Sep 86).....	79
PRAVDA Reports on Lugar South Pacific Trip (Moscow PRAVDA, 2, 5 Sep 86).....	86
'Anti-Nuclear Feelings in Region', by Aleksey Ivkin	86
New Zealand Ship Calls Policy, by O. Skalkin	87
Danish Parliamentarians, Soviet Officials Discuss Kola Peninsula (Otto Brix; Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE, 28 Aug 86).....	88
CSSR: Semipalatinsk Team States No Nuclear Tests Held (Prague CTK, 12 Sep 86).....	89
Japan's Foreign Ministry Welcomes USSR Test Ban Extension (Tokyo KYODO, 20 Aug 86).....	90

RELATED ISSUES

Moscow Press Conference: Security, Test Ban, SDI (Andrey Ptashnikov, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 11 Sep 86).....	91
Austria's Vranitzky Writes to Gorbachev on Arms Issues, SDI (Kurt Seinitz; Vienna NEUE KRONEN ZEITUNG, 16 Aug 86).....	95
FRG Disarmament Official Holds Talks With GDR's Fischer (Hamburg DPA, 10 Sep 86).....	96
USSR's Arbatov Explains New Security Policy (Georgiy Arbatov Interview; Sofia TRUD, 3 Sep 86).....	97
Japan Reaffirms Non-Nuclear Policies to U.S. (Tokyo KYODO, 16 Aug 86).....	100

Japan: Planned 'New Jersey' Visit Sparks Controversy (Tokyo NHK, 19 Aug 86).....	101
Japan: 'New Jersey' Arrives for Port Call Amid Protests (Tokyo KYODO, 24, 25 Aug 86).....	102
Labor, Peace Activists Protest	102
'Calm' Returns 25 August	103

/12223

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

JAPAN'S CABINET MINISTERS DISCUSS SDI PARTICIPATION

OWO20537 Tokyo KYODO in English 0525 GMT 2 Sep 86

[Text] Tokyo, Sept. 2 KYODO — Cabinet ministers concerned with Japan's possible participation in the research phase of the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), will reach a conclusion on the matter on September 9, government sources said Tuesday.

The ministers' confab, led by Chief Cabinet Secretary Masaharu Gotoda, reviewed their past discussions in a fifth meeting Tuesday morning. They discussed whether Japan's participation in the SDI project would breach a 1969 Diet resolution over peaceful use of space. According to the sources, the Diet resolution is the biggest obstacle to Japan joining in research on SDI, a space-based antimissile system known as "star wars."

The ministers agreed that Japan's participation would not breach the Diet resolution because the project is being conducted by the U.S. The ministers also agreed that their September 9 meeting will finalize their report to be submitted to the cabinet.

Gotoda told reporters after the Tuesday meeting that the final decision is likely to be made within the first 10 days of this month. He added that he himself would announce the official decision.

In the Tuesday meeting the concerned ministers discussed how research might benefit Japan, Gotoda said. The United States will hold the final rights to any new technology developed in the SDI research, the ministers agreed. But they agreed that the result should be available to Japanese companies participating in the study, Gotoda said.

The ministers also concluded that their decision that SDI participation would not breach the Diet resolution must be explained to the ruling Liberal-Democratic Party through the Foreign Ministry. Gotoda said the ministers considered objections by opposition parties to Japan's joining SDI research. They will discuss the matter from "all considerable aspects" in the final meeting on next Tuesday, Gotoda added.

/8309

CSO: 5260/134

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

JAPAN GOVERNMENT ANNOUNCES SDI PARTICIPATION

Kuranari Informs U.S.

OW090937 Tokyo KYODO in English 0933 GMT 9 Sep 86

[Text] Tokyo, Sept. 9 KYODO — Foreign Minister Tadashi Kuranari Tuesday sent a government statement on Japan's decision to start talks on participation in the U.S.-proposed strategic defense initiative (SDI) to U.S. Secretary George Shultz and Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, a Foreign Ministry official said. The statement was approved by the Cabinet meeting earlier the same day. The SDI program, popularly called "star wars" plan, is a space-based defense system research project announced by U.S. President Ronald Reagan in 1983. Weinberger requested Japan to participate in the project in March last year.

Talks To Begin Soon

OW090055 Tokyo KYODO in English 0050 GMT 9 Sep 86

[Text] Tokyo, Sept. 9 KYODO — Japan said Tuesday it will start talks with the United States to lay an overall framework for Japan's participation in the research phase of the U.S. strategic defense initiative (SDI), popularly known as the "star wars" project. In a statement released Tuesday, chief Cabinet Secretary Masaharu Gotoda said participation in the SDI research is in line with Japan's basic policy of seeking stable relations between the West and the East through a drastic cut in nuclear arms and the abolition of nuclear weapons.

The decision to participate was approved by the Cabinet in a meeting Tuesday morning. The government's decision will not violate a 1969 Diet resolution banning military exploitation of Japan's space development efforts, the statement said. The Japanese decision came after the government dispatched three missions to the U.S. to examine the program. The ministers concerned, under Gotoda's chairmanship, held a series of meetings which started last April to discuss the technology, strategy, and legal framework after the U.S. asked Japan to join the research.

U.S. President Ronald Reagan, who announced the project in 1983, told Japan early last year that the program is aimed at nullifying ballistic missiles with a non-nuclear defense system and seeks a total abolition of nuclear arms the statement said. The United States has asked 10 countries to participate in the SDI project. So far West Germany, Britain and Israel have accepted the request.

In a meeting with Reagan in January last year, Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone expressed "understanding" of the U.S. decision to go ahead with the SDI program but he stopped short of making any commitment about Japan's participation. In a report issued last April following the last fact-finding trip to the U.S., a joint government-private mission paved the way for the government decision, saying that participation could result in "enormous progress" in Japan's high technology.

The government statement Tuesday sought to stress the role of SDI as a strategic deterrent in East-West ties and a defense system to eliminate nuclear weapons. Nakasone has already confirmed with Reagan that the SDI program seeks no U.S. unilateral military superiority to the Soviet Union and is aimed at reducing offensive nuclear arms drastically, the statement said.

Reagan has also affirmed that the project will help maintain and strengthen deterrents in the West and that consultations with the U.S. allies and talks with the Soviet Union should be the precondition for the system to be developed and deployed, it said.

The government's talks with the U.S. will focus on setting up a government-to-government framework to smooth the path for the private sector's participation in the various SDI research programs. The government will not propose new legislation for the technological transfer and the protection of classified information on military technology. This will be left to the present domestic laws and the Japan-U.S. agreement in the defense sector, the statement said. Participation in the research program would help improve Japan's technological standards and lead to further Japan-U.S. cooperation under the bilateral security treaty, it said.

MITI To Set SDI Guidelines

OW090751 Tokyo KYODO in English 0742 GMT 9 Sep 86

[Text] Tokyo, Sept. 9 KYODO — The Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI) will map out guidelines to enable Japanese firms to better participate in the research phase of the U.S. strategic defense initiative (SDI), MITI officials said Tuesday. The officials said that such guidelines are needed because no Japanese firm has ever concluded a consignment contract with the U.S. Department of Defense.

The Japanese Government, which made the formal decision earlier Tuesday to participate in the SDI research, plans to pressure the U.S. to allow Japanese private firms to fully utilize the results of the research, the officials said. But MITI and other government agency officials speculated that SDI talks between the two countries will be tough, particularly on protection of industrial secrets and the rights by participating private firms to use the newly acquired technologies. Nevertheless, the officials agreed that the multibillion dollar project has the potential of producing advanced technological innovations.

Kuranari Questioned in Diet

OW090533 Tokyo KYODO in English 0449 GMT 9 Sep 86

[Text] Tokyo, Sept. 9 KYODO — Foreign Minister Tadashi Kuranari said Tuesday Japan's participation in the research phase of the U.S. strategic defense initiative (SDI) will not breach a 1969 Diet resolution banning military exploitation of Japan's space development efforts.

Responding to a question from a socialist Dietman in a House of Councillors Audit Committee session, Kuranari said the resolution called for "a peaceful use of space" when Japan develops and utilizes space. Kuranari said the SDI project, a space-based antimissile plan known as "star wars," will be developed by the United States, and the Diet resolution therefore does not apply to it.

Hiroaki Fujii, director general of the Foreign Ministry's North American Affairs Bureau, asked about U.S. research on x-ray lasers for use in connection with nuclear weapons, said the research is aimed at matching similar research being conducted by the Soviet Union. He said the SDI was aimed at producing a non-nuclear defensive system, and the x-ray laser research is only a part of the program.

/8309

CSO: 5260/137

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

JAPAN'S FOREIGN MINISTER ON SDI, TIES WITH USSR, PRC

OW300527 Tokyo KYODO in English 0217 GMT 30 Aug 86

[Text] Karuizawa, Nagano Pref., Aug. 30 KYODO — The Japanese Government will decide by September 10 whether or not to participate in the Strategic Defense Initiative, Foreign Minister Tadashi Kuranari said Saturday.

Kuranari, speaking at a Liberal-Democratic Party seminar here, stopped short of saying whether they would decide participation in the project.

A cabinet task force has studied the matter for the past half year after the United States invited Japan and other Western allies to participate in the research phase of the antimissile program.

One major hurdle lies in a Diet resolution limiting Japan's space research efforts to peaceful use only. Kuranari said the government is probing ways on how to resolve the Diet resolution so that a decision on Japan's participation can be reached.

Kuranari said the government is also working on the issue of fingerprinting requirements for foreign residents in Japan, which he said is aggravating Japan's ties with South Korea. He said he expected the matter to improve, and that the justice minister is "positive" about taking appropriate steps to achieve this.

On Japan's ties with the Soviet Union, Kuranari said Japan welcomes Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's proposed visit to Japan, noting that the visit reflects Gorbachev's policy of attaching more importance to Asia in Soviet foreign policy. He said the Japanese Government is hopeful that the visit will produce substantial results, and cited Japan's claim to four Soviet-held islands off northern Japan as a major thorn in bilateral ties. Also, he said Japan has no intention of separating politics from economics in its ties with the Soviet Union, and added that Japan's claim of sovereignty of the four northern islands "is an issue which can't be averted."

Turning to Japan's ties with China, Kuranari cited the "Yasukuni Shrine" problem as a major irritant in otherwise smooth bilateral ties. While Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone's decision to avoid an official visit to the shrine August 15 has temporarily averted a confrontation with China, the issue will continue to haunt bilateral relations in the future, Kuranari said. The basic problem, he said, is that although the shrine is dedicated to the war dead, Japan's A-class war criminals are also enshrined there.

On Japan-U.S. ties, Kuranari warned that the Kansai airport project will turn into another aspect of trade friction with the United States if the project contracts are not open to American firms.

On Japan's ties with Southeast Asia, Kuranari proposed that Japan accept more students from the region as part of Japanese efforts to build closer ties with the region.

Overall, Kuranari advocated a more active part in foreign policy, saying that Japan should play a role that is more compatible with its economic strength in the world.

/8309

CSG: 5260/133

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

JAPAN'S HIGH-TECH FIRMS SUPPORTIVE OF SDI DECISION

OW090723 Tokyo KYODO in English 0658 GMT 9 Sep 86

[Text] Tokyo, Sept. 9 KYODO — Japan's major high tech firms welcomed the government's decision Tuesday to participate in the U.S. strategic defense initiative (SDI) but stopped short of immediately committing themselves to the multibillion dollar project.

Toshiba Corp., a leading electronics manufacturer, said in a statement that it has a strong interest in possible spin-offs from SDI and its potential for upgrading of technology. "We as a maker of general electrical products believe we hold the technological potential to participate in many of the fields subject to the SDI research," the statement said. "The most crucial issue for private corporations is how to utilize the results of the SDI research," Toshiba said. Toshiba was one of the 21 Japanese firms whose engineers went on a fact-finding mission to the United States last spring.

Hitachi Ltd., which also sent an engineer to America as part of the investigative mission, said it will closely follow government-level consultations between the two countries on the type of participation and the right to use results of research.

Mitsubishi Heavy Industries Ltd., Japan's biggest heavy machinery concern and the flagship of the giant Mitsubishi group, also said it expects the SDI research to produce many spin-offs. A Mitsubishi heavy industry engineer was also on the last SDI mission, which included nine government officials.

During their stay in the U.S. from March 31 to April 8, members of the delegation visited the Pentagon, the Los Alamos national laboratory, the U.S. Army's strategic defense command, Lockheed Missiles and Space Corp. and other places, depending on their fields of concern — directed energy weapons (DEW), kinetic energy weapons (KEW) and surveillance acquisition tracking kill-assessment (SATKA).

Government sources said the U.S. is seeking Japan's technological assistance in the fields of optoelectronics and millimeter wave and related technologies in the five-year, 26 billion dollar research phase of the project. Mitsubishi Heavy Industries said Japan's participation in the SDI research is extremely significant in that massive investment in a wide variety of high tech fields and an assortment of talents will be brought together.

Yataro Mitsubayashi, director general of the Science and Technology Agency, noted that the government put national interest ahead of other issues in reaching the decision to start talks with the United States on the SDI research.

/8309

CSO: 5260/138

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

JAPAN OPPOSITION PARTIES DENOUNCE SDI DECISION—Tokyo, Sept. 9 KYODO—Opposition parties denounced the government Tuesday for its decision to participate in the research phase of the U.S. strategic defense initiative (SDI) program. The Japan Socialist Party said it opposes Japan's participation in SDI, which it said will breach not only a 1969 Diet resolution on the peaceful use of space but also the war-renouncing provisions of the constitution. The top opposition party demanded that the government retract the decision. Komeito said there are fears that the SDI program, to develop a space-based antimissile system, will put nuclear weapons in space and criticized the government decision for contravening Japan's long-established peace principles. The Japan Communist Party also blasted the decision, which it said was designed to extend the U.S. nuclear arms into space. It demanded that the government retract the decision. The government announcement also brought mixed reactions from Japanese scientists and researchers. A group of physicists is staging a signature-collecting campaign against the SDI program, while some scientists and researchers regard the prospect of SDI research as an opportunity to work on technical innovations. [Text] [Tokyo KYODO in English 0613 GMT 9 Sep 86] /8309

ITALY'S SDI PARTICIPATION—The agreement between Italy and the United States on the participation of important Italian firms in the implementation of SDI has been confirmed. The official document between the two governments will be signed next week. The firms concerned are SNIA BPD [expansion unknown], Comau and Telettra of the Fiat group; Selenia and Aeritalia from the IRI group [Industrial Reconstruction Institute]; and Danileo from the (Ettim) group. These branches of industry are highly sophisticated in electronics and arms technology. The United States may invest nearly \$14 billion in Italy. Washington has already reached similar agreements with the FRG and England and will soon sign documents with Japan. The Italian Communists and the radicals have asked for a parliamentary debate to discuss the Italian-U.S. agreement. [Text] [Rome International Service in Italian 1555 GMT 11 Sep 86] /8309

CSO: 5200/2768

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

FRG PAPER SAYS 1986 SUMMIT WILL PRODUCE NO ARMS AGREEMENT

Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG in German 5 Sep 86 p 12

[Article by Jan Reifenberg: "Poker Game Prior to Second Summit"]

[Text] Brussels, 4 September--The United States and the Soviet Union are raising the ante in their poker game about the date for a second summit between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev--but it is safe to say that it will take place in Washington, probably before the end of the year. Both sides are interested in continuing the dialogue at the highest level. But a comprehensive agreement on arms limitations does not seem to be in the cards. There is not enough time to overcome the basic differences of opinion--particularly with regard to the crucial matter of verification. Nonetheless, it does appear possible that the two heads of government will issue a statement of guidelines for their respective experts to follow in working out a subsequent agreement on deep cuts in strategic weapons and a gradual transition from the present strategy of simple deterrence to one of defense. In addition, agreements on intermediate range and short-range weapons and, in case of a positive conclusion of the Stockholm conference, on procedures for spelling out guidelines for the "confidence-building measures" sought at that conference, in Vienna and within the CSCE framework may be reached. There may also be some bilateral agreements, e.g. on establishment of "risk prevention centers" in Washington and Moscow.

NATO circles point out that the number and scope of Soviet-American and multilateral negotiations--from Vienna to Stockholm--has attained unprecedented density. The Moscow meeting at which Soviet and American representatives are discussing the reduction of strategic weapons and future defense systems in space will be followed by a round of talks in Washington this weekend which will also deal with the status of the Vienna MBFR conference. In Geneva, negotiations on a nuclear test ban are continuing and in Berne, bilateral talks about a ban on chemical weapons are going on. Talks on regional issues are also continuing, albeit without having reached a meeting of the minds. By the time of the Shultz-Shevardnadze meeting in Washington on 19 and 20 September, at any rate, the groundwork should have been laid for the establishment of a loose agenda for the second summit.

Alliance circles also point out that Gorbachev's proposals which indicated a readiness on his part to engage in more flexible negotiations, have been answered both in Reagan's letter of 25 July (to which there has been no Soviet response thus far) and in suggestions submitted to the Soviets in Geneva, Moscow and Washington. What appears important most of all is that the Americans are now ready to go beyond the previous upper limits on strategic weapons on land, on the sea and in the air in order to meet the Soviet proposals at least halfway. Thus, the United States is now offering a total increase of intercontinental warheads by about 25 to 7,500 while allowing for an increase of the warheads on Soviet land-based intercontinental missiles by 10 percent to a total of 3,300. The American side is also prepared to accept land-based mobile long-range weapons as well as an increase in aircraft-borne cruise missiles from 1,500 to 2,000. Reagan is also said to have proposed in his letter that negotiations be held on a total reduction of all long-range missiles and on joint research on missile defense systems of the future. This is tantamount to a seven and one-half year delay of the (by no means certain) start of the deployment of the initial components of the space defense system. A precondition, however, would be a revision of the 1972 ABM agreement on limiting mutual missile defense systems.

Alliance experts therefore believe that there is enough of a basis for the achievement of the "concrete results" which Gorbachev cited as a condition for a second summit meeting with Reagan. They say that progress is possible particularly with regard to those issues which are of immediate concern to Europe--provided that satisfactory formulas for verification can be found. But if the two sides should stick to their original positions on this issue, the summit might well be jeopardized. Only if the two superpowers are ready for a compromise is there a chance that it will be held. But the decision on this continues to be a political one. It cannot be reached by the military men who are always concerned with preserving their own achievements and are loath to give up any of the weapons systems they have fought hard to get. But both Reagan and Gorbachev must also take economic factors into account; they dare not place domestic stability in jeopardy. The American Congress has placed limitations on Reagan in its budget debate, cutting the budget requests for SDI drastically. A majority in the House has called for compliance with the upper limits set by SALT-II and for limiting underground nuclear testing to one-kiloton weapons. The figures regarding the huge American foreign trade deficit speak for themselves. A reduction in the steadily growing national debt is not in sight. All this seems to indicate that the SDI dream may at best lead to a new type of missile defense to protect a country's own bases but that it will not serve as the perfect defense shield for a country's population in the foreseeable future. The Reagan arms program has reached its zenith. The question is whether the President will now play the trumps he has acquired or whether he will make a political decision as between the concerns of the Pentagon and its chief, Caspar Weinberger, and the proposals for negotiations by his Secretary of State--as he did prior to the first meeting with Gorbachev in Geneva.

East European experts say that Gorbachev has a foreign trade crisis of his own to contend with which is due to the collapse of oil prices and the resultant hard currency shortage. Even a superficial look at the relevant figures makes it clear that the general secretary needs an arms limitation agreement with the United States if he wishes to modernize the Soviet economy. That, then, is the explanation for the Soviet hints of greater readiness for compromise with respect to inspection and verification of agreements. Their constant insistence on the conclusion of a general agreement on banning nuclear tests is an indication of their concern about a technological setback vis-a-vis the United States in the development of missile defense systems of the future. Their insistence on SALT-II and the ABM Treaty, in spite of their violation of both agreements, is an indication of this. East European experts are asking themselves whether Gorbachev and his ideas along these lines will be able to prevail with the Moscow party and government apparatus or whether he is still engaged in trying to consolidate his power. Experience has shown that this can turn out to be a lengthy process. Which is why Gorbachev will have to walk a thin line with Reagan at their second summit--with his suspicious military men and the old-line party ideologues looking on. In the end, a great deal will depend on how the Soviet Union's American experts describe the advantages of an agreement with Reagan in the latter's next-to-last year in office to him and in particular how binding such an agreement will be on the President's successor and whether it will provide the desired breathing spell for Moscow. And as for Ronald Reagan, time is rapidly running out on his desire to achieve a first agreement on arms reduction and to be remembered by posterity as a successful peace President.

9478

CSO: 5200/2760

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

NETHERLANDS DEFENSE MINISTER OPPOSED TO MORE NUCLEAR DEPLOYMENTS

PM031006 Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT in Dutch 29 Aug 86 p 3

[Correspondent's report: "Van Eekelen Is Against More Nuclear Warheads in the Netherlands"]

[Excerpt] The Hague — Defense Minister Van Eekelen considers that the Netherlands already makes a reasonable contribution to the stockpiling of NATO nuclear warheads. For this reason he sees no reason to stockpile more warheads in the Netherlands in a redistribution among the European nations.

This was announced by the Defense Ministry yesterday in a reaction to the plan of NATO supreme commander General Rogers to move half of the nuclear warheads currently stockpiled in West Germany.

According to Rogers, too large a proportion of NATO's nuclear warheads is to be found in the FRG.

He wants primarily to distribute the surplus among the southern European nations in NATO.

In the past NATO has indicated several times that the Netherlands also has too few of the alliance's nuclear warheads.

Van Eekelen agrees with Rogers that the vulnerability of the nuclear weapons in Western Europe must be reduced.

That is why the Netherlands Government decided to nuclearize its 8-inch guns in West Germany, the minister said.

He also pointed out that the supreme commander's proposal, made in the German magazine *Stern*, has not yet been discussed in the NATO Nuclear Planning Group. [passage omitted]

/8309
CSO: 5200/2770

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

SOVIET ACADEMICIAN FOKIN ON THREAT FROM U.S. BINARY WEAPONS

Moscow SOVETSKIY VOIN in Russian No 10, May 86 pp 46-47

[Article by Academician A. Fokin, president of the All-Union Chemical Society imeni D. I. Mendeleev: "The Binary Turn of the Arms Race"]

[Text] At the beginning of the current year, the U.S. House of Representatives followed the senate in approving a bill allocating large appropriations to the production of binary chemical ammunition containing nerve agents. Munitions of this type, just like the rest of the U.S. chemical arsenal, are typical offensive weapons of mass destruction. The steps being taken by Washington with regard to binary weapons are a logical continuation of the militaristic course of the U.S.A., which is designed to achieve military superiority.

Following tests of nuclear weapons and a test of the ASAT anti-satellite system, the American administration is proceeding to large-scale production of a variety of qualitatively new, death-dealing chemical weapons. Thus, a new step is being taken in the arms race which is intensifying the military threat and heightening international tension. This decision caused serious concern in scientific circles, among the progressive public in our country, and among all decent people of the world.

Just what are the binary chemical weapons of the U.S.A.? Known chemical compounds such as Sarin and Soman for example, and other lethal organophosphoric compounds, are used in them in a new way; in new types of shell fillings. Binary ammunition is distinguished from existing unitary rounds of ammunition in that it is equipped with two components. Capsules, each of which contains one component, are placed in a steel container. One or several containers are used to fill an artillery shell. After the shell is fired, the walls of the capsules, which are made of a polymer material, break down during the shell's flight and a mixing of components occurs, causing a reaction that leads to

the formation of a highly toxic substance. Where rockets are concerned, two initial components are mixed with the aid of a propeller that begins to spin after the rocket is launched toward the target and the partitions have been destroyed. Thus, the synthesis of the chemical agent is accomplished in the round of ammunition itself during its time of flight to the target.

The foreign press notes that the components of binary shells may be substances that are non-toxic or of slight toxicity. They can be stored or transported separately. This will introduce great difficulties for control in the event that a convention prohibiting chemical weapons is adopted.

The idea that it would be possible to obtain a needed chemical agent, the storage of which presents a risk to one's own troops, by means of combining two comparatively harmless initial products, is not new. Thus, in 1909 the use of the binary principle was proposed for the storage and employment of nitroglycerine. Later, during the Second World War, the U.S.A. and its satellites discussed the use of high explosives and some chemical agents (for example: a mixture of sodium arsenide and sulfuric acid, which forms arsine). These types of binary ammunition were tested under field conditions, but played no appreciable role at that time due to technical defects.

Broad development of binary chemical weapons began in 1954, when military chemists of the U.S. sought a means of producing medium bombs containing the nerve agent Sarin and large bombs of the Big Eye type for the new organophosphoric agent, VX. As a result of the research conducted, 155-mm artillery shells for the delivery of binary chemical agents (under the code name "XM 687") have appeared in the U.S. armed forces since 1972. Since 1971, the Pentagon has devoted 50 percent of its expenditures on chemical weapons to the creation of binary types of ammunition.

In June of 1980, the House of Representatives, without discussion, approved the appropriation of funds for the construction of a new plant for the manufacture of binary chemical weapons in Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

In 1982, the American administration announced a new program of so-called chemical rearmament and reinforced it with an allocation of large sums for the manufacture of materials for waging chemical warfare. The chief of the White House [as published] announced a decision to proceed to large-scale production of chemical agents, including binary ammunition. This decision was the beginning of a broad program of development of chemical

weapons in the U.S., expenditures on which will comprise about 10 billion dollars over a ten-year period. As a result of this program, America's arsenal of chemical weapons will be significantly expanded. The implementation of the program of "large-scale outfitting" of the U.S. Army with a new generation of chemical weapons, weapons that are binary, will lead to almost a doubling of stocks of this "noiseless" weapon of death in the U.S. arsenal; from 3 million to 5 million rounds of chemical ammunition. A plant has already been built in the city of Pine Bluff that is designed to manufacture 70 thousand rounds of binary ammunition per year (artillery shells and bombs) and it is ready to begin production.

The plant in Pine Bluff is just the first [plant] intended for the production of new, binary ammunition. It is known that there are more than ten modern plants in moth balls in the U.S. with a production capacity of tens of thousands of tons of chemical substances and ammunition per year, which could be brought into operation at any time.

Binary chemical warfare weapons are earmarked by the Pentagon's leadership exclusively for the extermination of troops and the civilian population. Material valuables will remain practically untouched by their use. These weapons are dangerous also because they give one the capability, by varying the initial components, to obtain new types of chemical agents with regard to which the organization of defense and detection and treatment will be more difficult.

The American binary program will cause particular danger to Europe. Washington does not conceal the fact that it plans to store binary weapons in Western European countries: in the FRG, England, Italy and Turkey. This threatens to turn Europe into the main theater of chemical war; a war in which the principal casualty would be the civilian population. According to the evidence of foreign experts, in the event that binary weapons are employed, civilian casualties in Europe will be twenty to thirty times greater than military casualties. It's worth bearing in mind that already, right now, every tenth shell, mine and bomb of the U.S. chemical arsenal is to be found in the European military bases of the U.S. Most of them are in dumps in the FRG, but they are also stored in England and Italy. Thus, Western Europe is becoming a double hostage of the Pentagon; first in a nuclear war and now in a chemical war.

U.S. Secretary of Defense Casper Weinberger at one time declared that the U.S. should constantly threaten the Soviet Union with the use of chemical weapons and should consider the advisability of their use in any military conflict. That is to say, in

essence the military specialists of the U.S. think that chemical warfare should be viewed as an integral part of military operations. What is more, in their opinion chemical weapons will become the primary weapons in the conduct of combat operations, where nuclear weapons are not used.

Along with this, the strategic military concepts of NATO also envision "integrated use of conventional, nuclear and chemical weapons and electronic equipment in war." In chemical munitions, the main bet is being placed on binary chemical weapons. It is well to recall the statement of the commander-in-chief of NATO Joint Forces in Europe, General Bernard Rogers, concerning the fact that it is precisely on the European continent that binary weapons will be used along with nuclear weapons from the very start of combat operations.

The relative simplicity of manufacture of components of binary chemical weapons can lead to their proliferation. And this is under conditions where at the present time there is no treaty or agreement of any kind concerning the non-proliferation of chemical weapons. There is also no ban on their manufacture in countries that do not have this weapon.

Therefore, the development of binary technology in the U.S. and the deployment of such weapons will undoubtedly be conducive to the removal of the last barriers blocking the manufacture of chemical weapons by the reactionary regimes of some countries. The growing danger may be halted only by the conclusion of an international treaty prohibiting the production, storage and use of this type of weapon. Attempting to justify, if only a little, its barbaric preparations in the eyes of world opinion, military circles of the U.S. are spreading assertions that the USSR considers chemical warfare as a feasible version of war. In reality, our country has never used chemical weapons anywhere and has always spoken out against their use and continues to do so.

The Soviet Union has always stood resolutely and consistently for a general prohibition of chemical weapons, for their complete removal from the arsenals of states and for the effective destruction of stores of them. The position of the Soviet Union is as clear as clear can be: There is no place on earth for chemical weapons. Their production, acquisition and storage should be prohibited and existing stockpiles destroyed. The prohibition of binary weapons should be a step on the road to total prohibition of chemical weapons.

This position was confirmed at the 27th CPSU Congress in the Political Report of the Party Central Committee, where it is emphasized that the creation of a comprehensive system of

international security requires, in particular, a ban on chemical weapons and their destruction, and renunciation of the creation of other means of mass extermination.

It's worth recalling that in the joint Soviet-American declaration made on the results of the meeting in Geneva from 19 to 21 November 1985 of comrade M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and R. Reagan, president of the U.S.A.; it says: "In the context of discussion of problems of security, the parties affirmed that they support a full and general prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stocks of such weapons. To that end, they agreed to step up efforts to conclude an international agreement that is effective and subject to control."

In light of this, is it possible to hope that common sense will in the end gain the upper hand over the imperial ways of the White House? Time will give an answer to this question. The world is waiting not just for correct declarations from the American administration, but for practical action in corroboration of them. To be delivered from the threat of lethal chemical weapons is in the interests of both the European peoples and the whole of humanity. It is impossible to put an end to this threat while creating new, binary forms of it, just as it is impossible to put an end to the nuclear threat while creating space strike weapons. To realize this, means to provide a most important condition for the strengthening of international security.

COPYRIGHT: "Sovetskiy voyn", 1986.

12784

CSO: 1801/228

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

ZIMBABWE'S NAM SUMMIT POLICY STATEMENT ON EUROPEAN ARMS CONTROL

LD071220 Belgrade TANJUG in English 0215 GMT 7 Sep 86

["Final Declaration: Europe"—TANJUG headline]

[Text] Harare, September 6 (TANJUG) — The non-aligned at their eighth summit in Harare welcomed the resumption of the discussions between USSR and USA on the reduction or elimination of medium range nuclear missiles deployed on the European Continent. They assessed that, if successful, these negotiations could constitute a historical turn in arresting the nuclear arms race and possibly reversing it.

The heads of state or government also expressed the hope that the forthcoming Vienna session of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) would reaffirm and strengthen the positive trends initiated by the Helsinki Conference. They noted that the non-aligned and neutral countries of Europe play an important and constructive role in the relaxation of East-West tension. This role is complementary to the global efforts of the Non-Aligned Movement and constitute concrete implementation of the principles and policies of non-alignment in Europe - say the non-aligned in their final summit declaration.

As Europe is the continent with the highest concentration of military armaments and the most marked division of states into rival blocks the heads of state or government of the non-aligned welcomed the efforts for the relaxation of tension in Europe. At the same time they stressed the close inter-dependence between the security of Europe and the security of the Mediterranean and the fact that confidence building measures in Europe should be extended to cover the Mediterranean region.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW RADIO BROADCAST OF 25 AUGUST PRESS CONFERENCE

LD251944 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 25 Aug 86

[Report by special correspondent Yevgeniy Grachev on 25 August USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs press conference conducted by Yuliy Vorontsov, USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs; Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces; and Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs]

[Text] [Grachev] The spacious hall at the Press Center is full to capacity. Hundreds of journalists, both Soviet and foreign, representing the media of many states of the world, have assembled here. There are more than a dozen TV, cinema and photo lenses alone trained on the participants in the press conference. The journalists' interest is explained by the theme of the press conference: For in the current international situation it is difficult--rather, it is impossible to get away from the question--to be or not to be; will the earth continue to remain the cradle of humankind, or will it become a lifeless desert, burned up in a nuclear blaze? There is no one indifferent to this main question. Here is what was said by Yuliy Mikhaylovich Vorontsov speaking at the press conference.

[Begin Vorontsov recording] The statement by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 18 August of this year on one of the key problems in international politics--the ending of nuclear tests and the decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions to 1 January 1987, stands, it can be said without exaggeration, at the center of the world's attention.

The overwhelming majority of governments and of political and public figures, and ordinary people in all countries express themselves decisively in favor of an urgent end to nuclear explosions. In opposition to them are a mere small but stubborn and influential group of persons in the United States who are in support of nuclear explosions continuing to shake our planet. A noticeable nervousness prevails now in Washington; contradictory arguments are made in favor of the United States continuing nuclear explosions. Here are a few examples: The White House Chief of Staff Donald Regan speaks about the United States supposedly not being against a treaty on a comprehensive and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, but it

cannot, so he says, accept it without an appropriate monitoring system. Other representatives of the President of the United States reject the monitoring thesis and say bluntly that the United States needs the tests to improve its nuclear weapons. Washington has also muddled its arguments as to who is catching up with whom in the nuclear arms sphere. So essentially, the United States has no rational explanations as to why it does not want to join the Soviet moratorium, if it will not be acknowledged that the nuclear explosions are needed by the United States exclusively for continuing the nuclear arms race in a vain attempt to achieve military superiority. And of course, the matter does not lie in monitoring. The Soviet Union has in essence proposed all sorts of monitoring, even, in our opinion, sometimes over and above requirements. And the United States all the same will not take up halting nuclear tests. As is now clear to all, Washington is here hardly moved by concern over monitoring but an attempt to create a cover in order to continue to carry out work for creating new classes and types of nuclear weapons.

[Vorontsov continues] Of late, this has been the objective too, of the preparations for using the energy of a nuclear explosion for the implementation of the star wars program. I can state with all responsibility that as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the problem of monitoring the ending of nuclear tests does not exist. This may be clearly seen if only by the example of the joint Soviet-American experiment on monitoring which was conducted by American and Soviet scientists in the Semipalatinsk area. The accord on this experiment was supported by the Soviet government which expressed its readiness to contribute in full to its implementation on our territory. The American Administration is still not demonstrating the same readiness in regard to the parallel execution of the same experiment on monitoring on American territory.

The Soviet Union highly appraises the joint work of the heads of state and governments of the six states--the "Delhi Six": Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden, and Tanzania--toward the earliest possible cessation of nuclear explosions. We have already expressed our readiness to utilize the proposal of the "Delhi Six" on rendering assistance to the monitoring of the ending of nuclear tests, including on-site inspection, naturally, if this is also adopted by the other side, the United States. We have also expressed a positive attitude to the proposal to organize a meeting of experts of these six countries with Soviet and American experts, which was mentioned in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's reply to the heads of state and governments of the six countries, published today.

There is every basis now for ending the nuclear fever on earth once and for all by means of a Soviet-American moratorium, and subsequently, a treaty. For the question of a moratorium, should be examined not in isolation, and not only as a measure toward ending nuclear explosions, but in the context of the overall problem, that of delivering mankind from nuclear weapons, as a kind of prologue to complete nuclear disarmament.

The ending of nuclear explosions is capable, to put it figuratively, of serving as one of the threads which, once pulled, would make it possible to start unwinding the whole complex tangle of the problem of nuclear disarmament. If there are no such explosions then new nuclear weapons will not be developed [sozdavatasya], and serious limitations will be created for those which already exist. And this will apply inequal measure to both the United States and the Soviet Union.

I would like to hope that in the final analysis common sense will still prevail in Washington, and that an historic opportunity on the path toward ending the arms race will not be missed.

We repeat once again that reaching an agreement with the United States on ending nuclear tests, with full monitoring, including on-site inspection, is possible, and quickly, too. Such an agreement could be signed at the Soviet-American summit which, as has been stated more than once by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is possible if the right political atmosphere is created for it, and if its success is ensured. [end recording]

[Grachev] The interest of journalists was naturally raised by that part of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement which stated that the USSR would not permit military superiority to be achieved over it, and that America's "Star Wars" program would be devalued by corresponding measures. Marshal Akhromeyev replied to these questions.

[Begin Akhromeyev recording] When they talk about the United States' preparations for "Star Wars," then what is meant is their preparation for the deployment of a multi-stage system of anti-missile defense for the territory of the United States, and for the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment of strike space weapons. The purpose of the U.S. preparation for "Star Wars," that is the implementation of what I have said, is to devalue the strategic nuclear forces of the Soviet Union, that is to disarm the USSR and thus provide the United States of America with the opportunity to permanently threaten the Soviet Union with a mass nuclear missile strike.

[Akhromeyev continues] And two aspects are being pursued, and there are two aspects here: On the political level, that the deployment of the anti-missile defense system of the country and space-strike weapons undermines the existing balance and leads the talks between the Soviet Union and the United States on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms into a dead end. It undermines faith in the realistic nature of these talks. It creates instead of stability a strategic chaos and sharply increases the risk of nuclear war.

On a purely military level, this program undermines the existing military balance. If the United States continues work to implement its Star Wars plans, the Soviet Union will have to take appropriate measures, and if necessary we shall quickly find an answer; moreover, this will not be the one

the United States expects it to be. It will be an answer that will invalidate the Star Wars program. This was clearly stated by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the party, in his statement. As a military man, I can say that the United States does not possess a monopoly of scientific-technical progress in military matters. The development of science and technology in the military-technology field has reached a level where the eternal struggle between the sword and the shield, between defensive and offensive weapons, is today being solved not in one, but in several directions. For every action, a reliable means of counteraction can be found. In response to the action by the United States in undermining the balance with the help of the creation of the country's anti-missile defense and space-strike weapons, the Soviet Union could undertake an identical answer. It is in the position to do this. Strategic offensive weapons, too, can be perfected to such an extent as to make the program for the anti-missile defense of U.S. territory a fabulously expensive and extremely difficult matter to accomplish.

Other answers which will invalidate the Star Wars program are possible, too. In this situation, the Soviet Union is forced to carry out fundamental research in many directions. Among them are those who foresee with a fair amount of confidence effective measures for counteracting the anti-missile defense of the country's territory. Moreover, these measures can be implemented promptly. If the United States does indeed deploy its in-depth system of anti-missile defense of the country and space-strike weapons, the Soviet Union will select those methods of action which to the utmost extent meet the interests of its defense capabilities and in its turn will confront the United States with the need to seek an answer to this. Our measures will not be those toward which Washington would like to include us. [end recording]

[Grachev] The correspondent of Finnish television drew the attention of those taking part in the press conference to the fact that Washington at the present time is talking a lot about the fact that United States is allegedly lagging behind the Soviet Union in the field of nuclear arms, and that it is thus essential for the Americans to continue their nuclear tests.

[Begin Akhromeyev recording] Unfortunately, I have to state that the United States is not lagging behind the Soviet Union in nuclear tests. Such statements are not in accordance with reality. The facts say something else. At the present time, the United States is the leader in nuclear tests.

If one takes all the nuclear tests by all countries carried out over the whole of time, then the United States has carried out over 50 percent of nuclear tests out of the overall number carried out by all countries. Furthermore, in each sphere taken separately, be it in the air, underground, or under water, the United States has conducted more nuclear tests than the Soviet Union.

If one takes the last 2 years, then in 1984 the United States and the Soviet Union carried out approximately the same number of nuclear tests. In 1985, prior to the moratorium the Soviet Union conducted nine while the United States carried out 20. This year, as everyone knows, since 1 August 1985, that is for over a year, the Soviet Union has not been carrying out nuclear tests, while the United States has carried out 18 nuclear tests since the moratorium began.

Those are the facts. Where then can there be any question of lagging behind? It is true that in such cases there is always talks about how the Soviet Union is ahead of the United States in this area, although when it benefits the United States or the people who advocate this point of view, then, on the contrary, they say that the Soviet Union is overall immeasurably behind the United States. But in this case, the minute that it is advantageous, they say no, the United States is lagging behind the Soviet Union.

That is not the point. The point is that if nuclear tests are stopped, then no anti-missile defense can be set up for the country, space-strike weapons cannot be created and cannot be developed--in any case, not on a full scale and not to full strength in the way the United States understands it, as the United States intended.

[Akhromeyev continues] The point is this: The point has nothing to do with lagging behind, but the desire to modernize and completely renew strategic nuclear forces. For that, new warheads are needed. There is also the desire to develop the country's antimissile defense, and for that, nuclear power sources are needed. The United States therefore is opposed to banning nuclear tests. [end recording]

[Grachev] Developing the idea that the Soviet Union is constantly increasing its efforts in the struggle for peace and for the strengthening of trust and cooperation between people, it nonetheless has no intention of waiving principles of security, either those of its own security or of its friends, Comrade Akhromeyev continued:

[Begin Akhromeyev recording] The question of stopping nuclear tests has two sides. It has both the political and the military sides. From the political viewpoint, the question is for peaceloving states and the world public to achieve a ban on nuclear tests through their joint efforts. In answering an earlier question, I already said that in this case, in essence there will be a prohibition on the further development of nuclear weapons that is on the creation of new weapons systems. In that case, the deployment of strike space weapons and of the country's antimissile defense--that is the SDI as they call it in the United States or as it is now habitually called everywhere--will be seriously impeded, if not made impossible.

It is natural that the Soviet Union as a peaceloving state has an interest in this. In announcing the moratorium, it calculates that peaceloving states and the world public will support it in this matter.

The military side is really...[Akhromeyev changes thought] well this is a matter of no mean seriousness; we know who we are dealing with and we have no small amount of experience but, in the given instance we are all together in the Soviet Union: Both the political leadership and the military leadership see this matter in a comprehensive way, and although it is not simple for us and we must make a very careful assessment of the correlation of forces, and the correlation in the area of nuclear tests. We consider that as yet it is tolerable to accept a certain degree of detriment. [sentence as heard]

The country's defense capability is being maintained; both as far as our country and as far as our friends and allies are concerned, it is being maintained at an appropriate level. [end recording]

[Grachev] Numerous questions were linked with the problem of monitoring, about which Comrade Vorontsov had this to say:

[Begin Vorontsov recording] At the present time, given today's technical possibilities, we set no frontiers or limits to monitoring. I already have had an opportunity to say this at the beginning. We agree with the types of monitoring currently in existence. What will happen in a year's time is not known, but as for the present types of monitoring, we agree to them; namely, to making full use of all the national technical resources at the disposal of not only the Soviet Union and the United States, but also of other states. In this regard, the Delhi Six proposals are also valuable: They propose to put their technical resources at the service of monitoring and we agree to this idea.

We agree to international verification, including participation in this verification by any countries that will be ready to join in. Finally, we are also ready for on-site inspections being carried out. How is all this to be implemented concretely? Our specialists--together with the U.S. ones and, naturally, the Delhi Six--can take their places at the same negotiating table and I am confident that given the large quantity of materials already accumulated; given the research material on monitoring already at hand from the previous talks; given the existence of such a base, I think that concrete monitoring measures can be worked out literally during the course of 1 of 1 and 1/2 months.

[Grachev] It is maintained in Washington that the carrying out of nuclear explosions is determined by the necessity of verifying the combat readiness of nuclear warheads. Here is Marshal Akhromeyev's view:

[Begin Akhromeyev recording] I must say that, on the whole and to some extent, this does correspond to reality: A proportion of nuclear tests being carried out by both sides is carried out by them for the purposes of

verifying already existing nuclear devices and for the purpose of determining the extent to which they are reliable. This proportion, however, is immeasurably small. Let us put it this way: Approximately 80 percent of nuclear tests and possibly more are carried out for the purpose of testing new nuclear devices that are destined for new nuclear arms being manufactured or for energy sources for space, in order to deploy offensive nuclear arms there. But then the USSR does, after all, propose to halt nuclear tests mutually. This means that the USSR halts them and the United States halts them. This means that neither our nuclear weapons, nor United States nuclear weapons will undergo reliability tests. After all, we thus place the sides in the same conditions. That is why it is not this--and I repeat again--it is not this that constitutes the main cause; the main cause is the desire to create more and more new nuclear arms systems. [end recording]

[Grachev] A large group of questions was connected with the reaction in various countries of the world to the Soviet leadership's statement:

[Begin Vorontsov recording] Judging by all, there are differences between Washington, other NATO capitals, and the capitals of other states that do not belong to military alliances.

Unfortunately, a militarized mode of thinking still has the upper hand in Washington; a mode of thinking that belongs to the past, a mode of thinking of people who have no wish to look into the future, not even the nearest future. What does it bode for us if the mountains of arms continue to grow ever higher? In the European countries, which are United States' allies, there are differences. There are sober-minded views that are being heard, already now.

Then there are appeals being made to Washington to take a new approach to this whole problem, which is complex and important for the world's future. Third, there is the attitude to this in many, many other world capitals: I believe I will not be guilty of an untruth if I say that in the Third World countries, I have not heard a single voice calling for nuclear tests to be continued, or even for the arms race to be continued. As I see it, in those countries peoples and governments are unanimous that it is time to halt this race, to embark on halting this race. This needs to be done now, not put off until tomorrow or until next year, but done now. That is how the range of feelings in the world now stands. [end recording]

[Grachev] Naturally, the United States' allies are following in the wake of White House policies, and the form of the questions at the press conference revealed concern on the part of the journalists over the position taken by ruling circles in NATO countries, first of all in Britain. Describing the reaction among the United States' allies, Comrade Vorontsov said:

[Begin Vorontsov recording] The fact is that out of all the Western European countries, Britain is, in effect, the one that most plainly has supported

Washington's--let us cautiously call it--rather strange position. I would not identify this support with British public opinion. For instance, not long ago I came upon a very interesting statement by the quite well respected London paper THE OBSERVER, which said forthrightly that the U.S. President is convinced that he will get more from continuing tests than from halting them, and British Prime Minister Thatcher goes along with him on this. But, their position is erroneous, THE OBSERVER writes: Sooner or later testing has to be halted if one is to aim to completely stop the present senseless arms race. So why not do this now? A very sensible question. [end recording]

[Grachev] Many other questions were asked at the press center and an exhaustive reply was given to each one.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: COMMENTS ON MORATORIUM 3-16 SEPTEMBER

Hammer, Gale Cited

PM110323 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Unnamed TASS Correspondent report under the general headline "Real Path to Disarmament": "A. Hammer-R. Gale: Developing Cooperation" — capitalized passages printed in boldface]

[Text] "I CONSIDER IT MY MOST IMPORTANT MISSION IN LIFE TO HELP BUILD BRIDGES OF FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN OUR COUNTRIES IN THE NAME OF PEACE" — Armand Hammer, chairman of the board of America's Occidental Petroleum, stated in an interview with your TASS correspondent. He is visiting Odessa for the opening 1 September of an exhibition of paintings entitled "Five Centuries of Masterpieces" from his collection, including 120 works by Rembrandt, Michelangelo, and other great masters.

Armand Hammer said that he chose Odessa to mount the exhibition not only because it is where his father was born but also because it is near this city, in Yuzhnyi, that the Odessa port plant, a very large ammoniate fertilizer production enterprise in whose construction Occidental Petroleum took part on a barter basis, operates.

"This plant," Hammer noted, "is a fine example of how the USSR and the United States can successfully cooperate to mutual advantage. The Soviet partners have always clearly kept to their contract commitments. I am convinced of this by more than 60 years experience of cooperation with them.

"The Soviet Union's extension of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 1 January 1987 is a concrete and bold step on the path toward preventing nuclear war. The new political thinking corresponding to the realities of the nuclear age, a thinking consistently demonstrated by the Soviet Union," Armand Hammer stressed, "makes me, a man made wiser by a lifetime's experience, an optimist."

"WITHOUT THE NEW THINKING WHICH THE SOVIET UNION CONSISTENTLY DEMONSTRATES TO THE WORLD TODAY, THE VERY EXISTENCE OF HUMAN CIVILIZATION BECOMES IMPOSSIBLE" — Professor Robert Gale of California University, the well-known U.S. bone marrow transplant specialist, stated to your TASS correspondent. "Despite the differences in their political and socioeconomic systems, people are obliged to learn the art of peaceful coexistence if they want to go on living at all."

"I am convinced that nuclear weapons must be completely destroyed, as the Soviet Union proposes. The way to achieving this humanitarian goal runs through trust. The latter may be created when people come to know one another better."

U.S. Propaganda 'Attack'

AU080610 Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI in Polish 3 Sep 86 p 2

[NOVOSTI article "Specially for ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI" by NOVOSTI commentator Spartak Beglov: "'Knights Move' in Washington")]

[Text] Of all the official "arguments" put forth by Washington against the new Soviet call for a halt to nuclear tests, I was the most surprised by the one saying that Moscow is allegedly presenting the abovementioned initiative with complete detachment from the subject of nuclear disarmament. White House spokesman Larry Speakes was the

first to present such an argument to the world last Friday, complaining at the same time that Mikhail Gorbachev had avoided the problem of arms reductions in his 18 August statement. L. Speakes said that if the USSR is interested in eliminating nuclear arms, it should occupy itself with this matter.

As we can see, American Government circles have reached the conclusion that maintaining a defensive position is inconvenient and that the time has come to proceed to an attack. In the currently popular language of chess, this is called playing the knight. As we know, a knight may jump over several pieces to reach a selected position. And the calculations are not difficult: I guess — not everyone in the West has acquainted himself with the full text of the Soviet diplomat's statement expressing in a precise and business-like way the USSR's stance on arms reductions and nuclear disarmament.

It is difficult to regard this propaganda move or gambit by Washington as a legitimate one. One must have a special knack for distorting facts to see any avoidance of matters of disarmament in the Soviet proposals concerning the elimination of nuclear weapons and radical arms reductions. However, if this issue is meant to be understood as nothing other than a struggle by Washington to achieve disarmament by constantly increasing arms, then Moscow is no partner in this. It is not a policy of control over armaments that the U.S. Government is implementing, but obscurantism, revealing the basic difference in our times between the force of inertia, dictated by the difference in our times between the force of inertia, dictated by the old way of thinking and acting, on the one hand, and the new way of thinking, demanding world-wide unity in the face of the common danger of nuclear catastrophe, on the other.

It is worth taking at least one more look at the stormy past months of the year which the United Nations proclaimed to be the International Peace Year. On 15 January, the Soviet leader issued a bold plan of gradually eliminating nuclear arsenals and other types of mass-destruction weapons. Exactly six months have elapsed since the day when the 27th CPSU Congress presented a program for a universal system of international security while stressing at the same time that no one can guarantee such security with the aid of military and technological resources. Security can only be achieved by political means. In Geneva, the USSR presented a package of constructive proposals concerning a reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals. As far as a ban on chemical weapons is concerned, socialist Eastern Europe displayed everywhere a readiness to seek compromise solutions to problems causing disputes and suspicion during the Stockholm talks and in Vienna.

All this was done during the Soviet moratorium on all kinds of nuclear detonations, which has already been in force for one year and has been extended three times. Mikhail Gorbachev thought it appropriate to recall this entire complex of initiatives that is

awaiting a reply when he announced 10 days ago that the Soviet moratorium, which in itself requires proper political consideration also by the American side, would be extended.

But if the Soviet moratorium provides evidence of the seriousness and honesty of the entire Soviet nuclear disarmament program, then Washington's avoidance of reciprocity diminishes the credibility of American politics concerning modern-day problems even more. One cannot avoid the conclusion that throughout 1986, Washington has been seeking and finding satisfaction in demonstrating force and concentrating energy in those places where new and better weapons are being developed. It looks as if Washington has begun to think that all of the United States achievements are the result of a rise in its military might and that all losses are the result of negotiations and accords. This odd policy makes national security seem incompatible with international security. Here is a concrete example. A treaty on the nuclear nonproliferation was enacted 16 years ago. Did it not strengthen the security of the Americans as cosignatories? I believe that not even in the United States will we find anyone who denies this. [paragraph continues]

But this same treaty committed the United States and the other nuclear powers who signed it to reaching an accord on a ban on all types of nuclear tests as quickly as possible. And what are the so-called guardians of U.S. national security aiming toward? They are more than ever opposed to a halt to nuclear tests and, therefore, opposed to the first step leading to a world free of nuclear weapons, in other words, a really safe world. From Nevada one can smell "restricted nuclear" and "star" wars at a time when White House representatives are still trying to assure everyone that no one is defending the "spirit of Geneva" more firmly than they.

Urgency Stressed

PM111701 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 36, 7 Sep 86 p 5

["Notes From a Press Conference" prepared by Yuriy Bandura and Yuriy Buksin: "Before We Have Only Seconds"]

[Text] Seven minutes to midnight. That was the time shown in 1980 by the symbolical clock on the cover of a U.S. magazine. "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists", to remind people how near we have come to the brink of the thermonuclear abyss: seven minutes to catastrophe. A year later the hands on the dial were moved three minutes closer to the tragic end of civilization, after the experts had assessed the nature of the Reagan administration's new military programmes.

Question by MN: What is the time shown by this clock today, after the extension of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear blasts till January 1, 1987?

Academician Georgiy Arbatov, Director, Institute of the USA and Canada, USSR Academy of Sciences:

Today, two hands are gripping the handle used to set the clock's hands. One of them is striving to set the hands back and, maybe, even to push the hands nearer to the fateful line. We are at present at the decisive frontier and the future will show which hand is the stronger. But the matter is not only in the future. I think that the direction in which the hands will move depends on everybody — the Europeans, the Asians, the Americans and the Soviet people. On everyone. This is our common concern.

Valentin Falin, Board Chairman, NOVOSTI Press Agency:

The clock, which for a long time used to be a symbol, has turned now into a sort of reality. Considering the deployment in Western Europe of U.S. first-strike weapons when their flight time to target is 6-8 minutes, the 54 minutes left behind already correspond to reality -- we are living six minutes to war. And if we assume that the Americans start to implement the SDI programme, then humanity will find itself removed from war by only 30 seconds. In that case, any short-circuit in the system called Strategic Defense Initiative will entail irreversible consequences. Therefore, the question of how to reverse the clock hands is a task for the entire humanity and a very pressing task. Because the clock is working -- it is registering your time and our time.

Academician Vitaliy Goldanskiy, member, Committee of Soviet Scientists for Peace, Against Nuclear Threat; editor-in chief, "Chemistry of High Energies" Magazine:

I'd like only to add using the now so popular chess terminology, that the world is faced with the grave danger of the flag falling on the clock. And this first move needed in this time of trouble is the immediate ending of nuclear tests. [answer ends]

Yes, time imperiously demands action in the name of peace. The prolongation by the USSR of a moratorium is a befitting reply to this demand -- such was the consensus of opinion of the three experts who spoke to the journalists at the Press Centre of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

"The further on, the more clear it becomes that the ending of nuclear blasts is not simply a second-rate measure. It is not just a political gesture and not simply a symbol of goodwill, but a major practical step of paramount importance, and I stress -- a practical step along the road towards the ending of the nuclear arms race and removal of the nuclear threat," Georgiy Arbatov said at the press conference.

The people at the Press Centre were offered to imagine a mirror situation -- The USA does not detonate nuclear blasts for a year and then declares that it is extending this nuclear Lent, so to speak, for six more months, whereas the USSR is continuing, meanwhile, exploding one bomb after another, and its media simply keeps silent about this. It is easy to imagine the Biblical wrath the U.S. press, TV and radio would be raining down on us every day -- and would probably be right in so doing. But not we are encountering an absolutely different situation."

This situation is simple: The latest Soviet proposals encounter in the USA a sort of conspiracy of silence. And it is not a spontaneous, but a well-organized conspiracy.

An example was cited at the press conference: The U.S. NBC TV network conceived an interesting series of programmes-dialogues, with the participation of prominent people from the USSR and the USA -- defence and foreign ministers, military leaders from the general staffs and, maybe, political leaders. The U.S. Government, however, was against the idea.

The pressure is mounting. A few days ago, Donald Reagan, White House Chief of Staff, openly hinted, in a very annoyed manner, that the attention given to the Soviet moratorium would be regarded as the mode of action which the USSR was aiming to achieve.

The irritation is quite understandable. The NEW YORK TIMES wrote, a day before the peremptory shout voiced in Santa Barbara by the White House spokesman: The Reagan

Administration.... is having trouble shaping the public debates over the issue of nuclear testing is synonymous in the public mind with the arms race and that the idea of stopping testing is one of that appeals to the popular imagination."

But what appeals to the popular imagination does not appear at all to the imagination of those who govern this people. The White House, ever since Hiroshima Day 1985 when the Soviet state imposed a moratorium on its own nuclear tests, has been rejecting the very idea of ending tests of nuclear weapons.

Answering the question by the correspondent of the GDR TV, Valentin Falin said that the Soviet moratorium offers a realistic opportunity for a transfer to the fulfillment of the accords, reached in Geneva last year:

"The question of ending nuclear weapon tests is today the most simply question both technically and politically. It is simple because the USSR has not been testing for a year already. It is simple because the goodwill on the part of the USA is indicated above all to settle the question. In the current year the USSR has made various proposals in order to reach the relevant accords. Unfortunately, the U.S. side did not accept a single one and, if we were to judge by the facts, they were not even considered seriously. In the meanwhile, the answer to what both powers want for the future, is contained precisely in nuclear weapon tests or in rejecting them — do they want to further expand preparations for a nuclear war or have they really decided to reverse the events in this field and bring about the deatomization of the world?"

Why, then, does the USA not agree to the moratorium? Why does it continue to deafen the Earth with new blasts? This question it continue to defend the Earth with new blasts? This question was subjected to all-around discussion at the press conference. Answering it, Vitaliy Goldanskiy explained:

"The necessary components of all nuclear weapons are the explosives of the A-bombs and the 'fuse' of a thermonuclear mixture in the H-bombs. The explosives are plutonium, uranium-235 or uranium-238, and the 'fuse' is lithium deuteride or a deuterium-lithium mixture. [paragraph continues]

All of them are absolutely stable in the nuclear sense, and only the third one — a component of the deuterium-tritium mixture — lasts only a few years (its half-life is equal to 12.5 years). That's why tritium is periodically replaced in thermonuclear weapons. This is done without any nuclear blasts.

"Nuclear weapons go off when uranium-235 or plutonium are transferred to a supercritical state. This is achieved either by 'shooting' one block of a relevant substance into another, or by subjecting this substance to pressure from all sides with the aid of conventional explosives. Therefore, the design of each nuclear bomb, warhead, or shell includes a charge of conventional explosive, as well as detonators for this explosive which include mechanical, electric and radioengineering devices. And, lastly, nuclear weapons include all sorts of assembly-structural parts made of different materials.

"When the weapons are in storage, all sorts of 'destructive' processes may be taking place in them. For example, the charges of conventional explosives may crack or suffer from chemical decay and uranium and plutonium are rather sensitive to corrosion.

"The matter is, however, that if we speak of already tested, series-produced nuclear weapons already accepted by the army, then there is no need for test explosions to

check up on the weapons' reliability. It is enough to check up on its separate components. The weapon can even be tested as a whole, but without the nuclear components. All sorts of methods of flaw detection and introscopy which make it possible to 'look inside the material' and methods of non-destructive control which are already very well developed, exist for this purpose."

Academician Goldanskiy's conclusion:

"Nuclear tests are really needed only for the development of new weapons systems, when, for example, it is necessary to secure a greater yield with the same size weapon, to reduce the weight or the size of the weapon, or to adapt the shape of nuclear warheads to new types of carriers. Explosions are also used to check up on the multiple-warhead capability, to test the behaviour of the warhead in extreme conditions, for example, within strong radiation fields. They are also used to study the possibility of pumping of an X-ray laser by a nuclear blast for the SDI programme (this is already the nuclear weapons of third generation). There are also reports of plans to use — along with uranium-235 and plutonium — also transplutonium elements such as, for example, californium. This makes it clear that when there is talk about 'testing of reliability' what is really meant is testing (by explosions) new means for waging thermonuclear war."

This is a well-grounded conclusion. However, modernization is not the USA's only goal. Valentin Falin drew attention to Washington's other goal:

"The Americans persist on a policy that attempts to draw the USSR into the race of developing new weapons systems. And such systems are getting costlier with each passing day. In other words, the idea is to employ the dangerous method of waging war without the practical employment of weapons. The USA has officially been adhering to this course since 1947 when the objective was formulated: to put the USSR in such unfavourable external conditions under which its system would be functioning under maximum stresses imposed from outside."

According to Georgiy Arbatov, similar goals can be discerned also in the U.S. Star Wars programme. The Academician substantiated his conclusion with the following example:

"A group of Soviet scientists recently visited the USA. And the U.S. space weapons experts from the Livermore Laboratory went out of their way to try to persuade us: 'Let's build up strategic defence together!' They even invited us to visit their laboratory. But why did they ask at all? Because they are counting on undermining us economically. But we state well in advance that all such plans made by Washington will fail. And, by the way, the Americans are already undermining their own positions by exorbitant military spending."

However, Washington's plans are dangerous not at all because they are doomed to failure. The danger is that the piling up of ever new heaps of arms is creating a situation that can escape the control at any moment.

Valentin Falin said: "If things develop the way Washington's leaders wish them to develop — and there is talk in Washington about the need of adding to the U.S. arsenals of not only binary, but bacteriological weapons as well, then the question of 'whether the catastrophe will happen' will be replaced with the question 'when will it happen?'"

Do the people in the White House realize the inevitability of such an outcome? Georgiy Arbatov answered this question:

"I think, the USA will change its stand when it becomes clear to the U.S. leaders that it is impossible to act otherwise, when the situation that is taking shape both in the USA and in the world will force them to do so.

"I remember discussing recently the breakdown in Chernobyl with an American friend of mine. He admitted that this tragedy dictates absolutely new approaches. He said that the most terrible act the USSR could commit against the USA would be to explode all its nuclear warheads on its own territory. Then, he said, you in the USSR would die in an instant and nearly painless death whereas we, Americans, would have to die for a long time tormented by nightmares. And that is really a facet of the present-day situation.

The situation, apparently, is really approaching the critical point, if it is already putting certain people into a suicidal dead end, where the only choice left is between instant death and death dragged out for decades. A sinister alternative. But it is also begotten by reality — by the cruel realities of the thermonuclear age.

Capitalizing on the "mirror method" already mentioned at the press conference, it would be the easiest thing in the world to readdress the American's recommendation to Washington. But the USSR is proposing something different. It proposes not a method for a kill all, but a way for survival. And by introducing the moratorium the USSR has already taken to this road.

That is why one would like to believe that Washington would really start seeking qualitatively new approaches to our time. One would like this metamorphosis, if it is fated to happen at all, to happen as soon as possible. However, one cannot as yet see, alas!, any tangible signs of a turn towards common sense in the top echelons of the U.S. Administration. What is much more noticeable is something quite different:

the reluctance to make even the first step along the road to ending nuclear tests;

an obsession with the Strategic Defense Initiative;

the outdated adherence to aggravating tensions in different global areas (as it is done today in the Mediterranean, offshore Libya);

the preparedness to discard the SALT-2 treaty.

Neither did journalists fail to notice the words recently spoken by Larry Speakes, White House Deputy Press Secretary. He said that if the Russians wanted a summit, that was good, if they didn't that suited the Americans fine, too. Everyone who cherishes a peaceful future wants a new Soviet-U.S. summit — granted there is a relevant political climate and the U.S. administration is prepared to start, at long last, the stone rolling. Everybody, that is, except the USA whose stand was explained by Speakes: as it turns out Washington is highly indifferent to whether the summit will or will not be held.

But, then, is it really indifferent? According to Valentin Falin, the disdainful indifference of the White House spokesman was nothing else but evidence of the sheer arrogance which has become deeply rooted in Washington. It is tantamount to the confession: "We don't care whether or not there will be a nuclear war."

However, the blasts in Nevada show that the White House's indifference is a mask. Because war preparations are going on full swing.

Georgiy Arbatov sees under the mask of the current administration the desire to destroy — even before 1988, the year of the next presidential elections, — as many of the obstacles as possible that are blocking the road to the arms race, so that Ronald Reagan's successors will not be able to rehabilitate anything, no matter how much they would like to do so. A participant in the press conference called such a strategy — the "bulldozer syndrome".

The bulldozer of catastrophe continues to squash the world's security. We are reminded of this by the symbolical clock which is leaving us less and less time to avert tragedy.

U.S. 'Cave Mentality'

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 8 Sep 86 pp 1-4

[Article by APN Political Analyst Vladimir Katin: "Commonsense vs. Nuclear Madness"]

[Text] The Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests has actually made it possible to hold a kind of international referendum on this issue. People in all parts of the world have welcomed Moscow's decision to stop nuclear tests until the beginning of next year.

Politicians and MPs, public figures and mass organizations regarded that action as an example of sensible and correct approach to universal security and a hope for abating nuclear fears. The Soviet moratorium was approved by the UN General Assembly, the Delhi Six member-states with the population of one billion, the heads of state and government of non-aligned countries representing nearly two thirds of the world's states. The leaders of the non-aligned countries attending their 8th conference in Harare appealed to all nuclear powers, first of all to the United States, to join the Soviet moratorium.

I think it is very typical of the present situation that actually no one except the Washington administration regards the moratorium as an action "beneficial" only to the Soviet Union. It is clear to everyone that the ban will benefit the whole world by saving it from destruction. I don't think that it was out of sympathy for the Soviet Union or dislike for the United States that government agencies and officials in West Germany, Spain, the Netherlands, Japan and other Western countries welcomed the extension of the Soviet moratorium, and Norway, Denmark and Greece expressed their disagreement with the U.S. administration's stand on a nuclear tests ban. Incidentally, such a disagreement was voiced by municipal councils of over 100 cities in the United States itself.

It is an obvious sign that the new mentality for our nuclear age is catching on among top-ranking officials and the public at large. Indeed, an increasing number of people come to realise that human civilization will

not survive a nuclear holocaust. The most perfect technological systems might prove to be faulty, witness the recent Challenger and Chernobyl accidents.

Therefore, urgent measures are needed to reduce the risk of nuclear war. The verifiable and complete ban on nuclear tests might become the first step along this road. Actually, the cessation of such tests can be compared with an ignition key in the mechanism of the arms race. Suffice it to turn the key to a neutral position, that is, cease the tests, and the nuclear arms race will lose momentum, slow down and soon come to a halt.

The unilateral Soviet moratorium has been supported throughout the world because this proposal is, in fact, a practical step towards the creation of a non-nuclear world. By refraining from the nuclear tests the Soviet Union is acting in compliance with the agreements achieved at the last November's USSR-USA summit in Geneva. I would like to emphasize this fact because the Geneva conference gave all nations a hope for an improvement, a fair spell in our planet's political climate. Thus on its part Moscow has taken another concrete political action to implement the Geneva agreements.

Regrettably, the United States has not made a positive response to it. Moreover, each time the Soviet Union extended its moratorium, the U.S. carried its further tests at the Nevada testing-grounds, with the latest on September 4. Were they a challenge to Moscow? Well, I've rather say, they were a challenge to the entire world and humanity.

The U.S. administration's nuclear obsession can ruin our Planet Earth. Not long ago U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger speaking at an American Legion convention again called for building up his country's nuclear potential and implementing SDI ahead of time. What it means, is an increasing number of nuclear tests to be carried out in the immediate future in order to speed up the development of the first-strike weapons. As for U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard Perle, he openly declares that he is against a universal agreement on a nuclear tests ban, even if it could be verified. Those are obvious examples of not only selfish but, rather backward mentality and inability to realize the full-measure of one's responsibility.

Such is the United State's attitude towards the discontinuation of nuclear tests, which also reveals its stand on the nuclear weapons issue. By opposing itself to the rest of the world, the U.S. administration is leading the arms race and thus giving it an even more dangerous, space momentum. We are fully aware of the goals which the right-wing, militarist grouping in the USA is setting itself: to do its best to maintain its war-business profits, attain military superiority and wear out the USSR economically. Eventually, all that can be reduced to an idea of seeking global dominance.

Such a policy line, plans and ideas are another specimen of cave mentality which is alien to our nuclear age. If a nuclear war broke out (which is, obviously, the aim of politicians like Weinberger), no one would survive to estimate the profit yielded by the production and sale of warheads. It would be absurd to think of gaining military supremacy over the Soviet Union or bringing its economy to ruin by the arms race. The Soviet leaders will never let it happen which is guaranteed by the Soviet Union's enormous economic, technological and scientific potential.

We will have to wait and see. However, the Soviet people would like to hope that the United States' further actions will be guided by realism and understanding of the need for joint efforts aimed at improving the international situation, curbing the senseless arms race and eliminating nuclear weapons. We would like to hope that common sense will triumph at last over the nuclear madness.

Scientist Outlines Benefits

PM110901 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 35, 8 Sep 86 pp 5-6

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences Aleksandr Kalyadin, member of the World Federation of Scientific Workers Standing Committee on Disarmament, under the general heading "The Historic Chance Must Not Be Missed": "A Scholar's View. To Think and Act in a New Way"]

[Text] Today the issue of the complete and universal cessation of nuclear weapon tests is exceptionally acute. On the one hand, these tests feed the nuclear arms race, which is about to escalate to a still more dangerous level, on the other, new political, scientific and technological options have emerged that make a test ban completely verifiable. And here one must first note the unilateral moratorium which the USSR recently extended for the fourth time plus the other constructive Soviet initiatives and programmes, demonstrating the effectiveness of the new mode of political thinking. The world community as a whole and prominent politicians and statesmen in many countries are more and more resolutely exhorting other nuclear powers, especially the U.S., to emulate the Soviet example, stop tests, and sign an agreement definitively outlawing them.

The advocacy of scientists for a ban on nuclear explosions is also significant. Recently scientists from various disciplines, who are analyzing problems associated with a test ban, have come together in several countries. Such prestigious international associations as the Pugwash Movement, the World Federation of Scientific Workers, and the recently created International Initiative Group are helping them to pool efforts.

Global Hazards

Two representative conferences, the International Forum of Scientists on Nuclear Test Ban and the International "Science, Technology and Peace" forum,

both held in Moscow not long ago, have discussed the major results obtained from a comprehensive investigation of problems related to a nuclear test ban. The Soviet moratorium, as Mikhail Gorbachev noted, has encouraged the participants, though they are of different political persuasions and have different approaches to the specific ways and means of ending nuclear testing, to vigorous action. After all, scientists are more fully aware than other people of the dangers of the atom. The conclusions and assessments at which they have arrived through an unbiased comprehensive analysis of all relevant aspects are of heightened interest.

One crucial conclusion is that the tests lead to the escalation of the arms race to a dangerously new and higher level, by which is meant the development of weapon systems and types with an increasingly diverse overkill, including some that can be used in space. The armed forces buildup will inevitably entail the development of a first-strike potential. There will be more nuclear munitions with a multiplied overkill. We can expect third-generation nuclear weaponry with selectively amplified factors. All this will upset the strategic equilibrium, thus entailing unpredictable consequences.

Regional stability and safety will suffer, inasmuch as continuing to test will exacerbate nuclear proliferation and give those who want nuclear weapons in the so-called "near-nuclear states" a freer hand.

Nuclear testing is likewise fraught with global hazards of another type. Ecologists are of the view that the earth we live on has reached a point where nuclear explosions must be outlawed immediately.

Japanese medical research has revealed that the radioactive contamination of the Pacific's surface by nuclear tests is correlated with the increasing incidence of a whole range of illnesses. Moreover, scientists have observed the genetic effects of nuclear detonations. Hence it is vital to stop the tests at once for the sake not only of the present but of successive generations. Otherwise humanity will face unforeseeable consequences deriving from modifications in the biosphere's genetic stock.

What a Test Ban Would Bring

First, it would result in greater strategic stability. After all, it is extremely difficult to boost buildup of the nuclear weapons and their modernization without tests. There would be far fewer opportunities for developing new strategic, operational, tactical, and medium-range nuclear weapon types and systems, as well as warheads for some carrier vehicles, such as cruise missiles, which constitute a destabilizing factor in that they are difficult to verify.

An end to testing would also be of paramount significance in restraining the augmentation of stocks of offensive nuclear armaments. Experts maintain that this would drastically minimize the likelihood of nuclear conflict, which would also serve to consolidate reciprocal security.

An end to testing would stonewall programmes for developing space-based strike weaponry, of which the X-ray laser, powered by nuclear detonation, is a possible crucial component.

Finally, comprehensive nuclear weapon test ban subject to appropriate international control procedures would serve to consolidate international confidence and ameliorate the world political situation. In fact, the related control machinery could prove of great benefit for promoting other aspects of disarmament.

Verification Is No Problem

For years the thesis that a moratorium is not effectively verifiable has been trotted out as the basic argument against an agreement for the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon testing. Seismologists, physicists and mathematicians equally declare that the technical aspects of control are no obstacle to the immediate cessation of nuclear explosions and the conclusion of the appropriate international treaty. On the contrary, the latest scientific data demonstrate that achievements in seismology and other disciplines and the higher level of international scientific cooperation in the area of verification afford far greater possibilities today for detecting and identifying explosions.

Major progress has been reached in the field of national seismic control measures. Thus, whereas in the 1970's only one-kiloton explosions could be recorded by the means then available for identifying seismic phenomena, today explosions of under 0.1 kilotons can already be detected. In fact, a seismological station can identify 20-30-ton underground explosions even from a distance of 2,000-3,000 kilometres. With several stations working to this end the potential for detection will be correspondingly greater.

Soviet seismologists say they can hear a one-kiloton explosion from 10,000 kilometres away. This is illustrated by the registration within the Soviet Union of a Nevada nuclear detonation. By means of the national seismological control stations within its boundaries the Soviet Union has been able, over a lengthy period of observation, to pinpoint and identify nuclear explosions of about one kiloton. On the other hand, U.S. seismologists claim that by employing similar control measures, the U.S. has not missed a single Soviet explosion of one kiloton or more over the past 20 years. It was held until lately that nuclear explosions could nevertheless be concealed through decoupling, which means the jamming of seismic signals by explosions within spherical subterranean cavities. However, calculations have convincingly demonstrated that the seismological control stations we have today are in a position to register nuclear detonations of this nature, even of low capacity to all practical intents, it is impossible to conceal the creation of the necessary subterranean cavities, given other control measures such as observation from artificial earth satellites. After all, to decouple completely an 8-kiloton explosion it would be necessary to extract as much rock as it took to build the Pyramid of Cheops.

International scientific cooperation is a highly effective method of broadening possibilities and improving seismological control techniques. With this end in view and in line with the corresponding agreement between the USSR Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Natural Resources Defence Council, a joint Soviet-American experiment is being conducted and some initial results have already been obtained.

Likewise of great significance is the multilateral cooperation within the framework of the Geneva Disarmament Conference of seismologists mounting technological experiments of an international character. The latest such experiment in 1984 involved 72 stations in 32 countries, including the USSR. These experiments have shown that the procedures which have been evolved are most effective. Currently in the preparatory stage is one more experiment in which the USSR is also involved, which will be carried out to lay the groundwork for an international system of seismological control over a nuclear test ban. This is one more major vehicle for cooperation and confidence, making for the successful application of science's latest achievements in the interests of peace.

Seismological control is by no means the only means of verification. Other methods that could be employed include hydroacoustic techniques on the high seas and satellites for the observation of the Earth's surface.

Consequently it may be stated that the present record of achievement in science in conjunction with cooperation between scientists in different countries have given substantial support to the conviction that control is not a stumbling block in prohibiting nuclear explosions in every medium.

The fundamental problem is political, not technological. This only amplifies the role and responsibility borne by all social forces, including scientists and their organizations. It behoves them to bring to the attention of governments and the public at large the available scientific data, their assessments of the pernicious consequences of continued nuclear testing, and the possibilities that now exist for ending these tests.

Finnish Politician Cited

LD092349 Moscow TASS in English 2156 GMT 9 Sep 86

[Text] Helsinki, 9 September (TASS)--The Soviet Union's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions has been highly appraised by general secretary of the Social Democratic Party of Finland, chairman of the Parliamentary Foreign Affairs Commission Erkki Liikanen.

Speaking in Mikkeli at a function of twinned cities of the USSR and Finland, he called upon other nuclear powers to join the moratorium. A ban on tests of nuclear weapons would be the first step towards elimination of all nuclear armaments. That would be a turn to real disarmament, said Erkki Liikanen.

A ban on tests of nuclear weapons would be the most efficient and fast measure to end the nuclear arms race, he believes. A ban on nuclear tests would stop development of new types of nuclear weapons.

Speaking of the Soviet-Finnish relations, Erkki Liikanen has said that these relations are based on mutual respect in accordance with the principle of peaceful coexistence in the relations between the two states.

'Disarmament Tango' Urged

LD101738 Moscow TASS in English 1714 GMT 10 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow September 10 TASS -- News analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

Silence reigns at Soviet nuclear testing sites for already the second year. The USSR has unilaterally stopped nuclear tests and is observing its voluntary moratorium. American instruments have been installed near the Soviet nuclear testing site in Semipalatinsk Region on agreement between Soviet and American scientists as a measure of verifying nuclear explosions.

On the other hand, the United States has carried out already 19 nuclear tests during the Soviet moratorium and, as the American press reports, is preparing new ones. No reasonable justification of this policy pursued by Washington exists. There is a spate of invented arguments in favour of continued nuclear testing by the United States. For instance, there is the attempt to contrapose the moratorium and arms reduction and even to prove that the moratorium and arms reduction and even to prove that the moratorium supposedly is a hindrance to starting the process of disarmament.

This is absurd but Washington uses this absurdity as a screen to conceal its reluctance to get down to the business of disarmament. But it is long time to start the process of limiting and stopping arms race because time is running out. Today the question stands as follows either an agreement is reached on stopping nuclear tests once and for all or the green light is given to even more dangerous military preparations involving the spreading of the arms race to outer space. No matter how they in Washington try to prove the opposite, the ending of nuclear tests is inseparably linked with a reduction of nuclear arsenals. Specialists in many countries, including American specialists, believe that a ban on nuclear explosions is probably the quickest and most effective way of stopping a further development of nuclear arms, because nuclear tests serve the only purpose of perfecting existing nuclear arms and creating new types of arms, including space weapons, to wage nuclear war.

If the United States Government does not want to stop nuclear testing and stubbornly continues the arms race, this means that it has on its mind preparations to unleash a new world war. The logic and consistency of action of the administration in Washington present an alarming picture. The present administration not only shows no interest in ending nuclear tests but also rejects out of hand proposals to this end. It can be said, figuratively, that whereas it takes "only two to tango" (meaning the process of disarmament at the present stage), the arms race in the near future is likely to become a real rock'n roll with an unlimited number of "dancers". Now is the best time for Washington and Moscow to start a "disarmament tango" precisely with a termination of nuclear blasts. All objective conditions have ripened for this. It is only political will on the part of the White House that is lacking.

'Lack of Political Will'

PM121211 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 11 Sep 86 p 3

[G. Dadyants "Dialogue with a Reader": "What Are They Testing in Nevada?"-- first graf is SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA introduction]

[Text] We continue our dialogue with readers on key problems of international politics. SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA international observer G. Dadyants replies to questions from S. Khudyakov, team leader at the Karbolit science-and-production association (Kemerovo city) superhard molding powders shop.

[Khudyakov] I have read in the newspapers that the Americans have carried out another nuclear test in Nevada. Are there any details about this?

[Dadyants] Judging by U.S. press reports, the explosion was carried out on the morning of 4 September in a deep underground shaft and its yield was equivalent to a force 3.5 underground tremor. The explosion was carried out as part of secret military research conducted by the Los Alamos atomic laboratory. The test was code-named Galveston. Incidentally, this laboratory is currently working on devices connected with the testing [otrabotka] of so-called beam weapons. This was already the 19th test since the USSR announcement of its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions on 6 August 1985, which has been extended four times.

[Khudyakov] People in our shop are saying that M.S. Gorbachev has driven the R. Reagan administration into a corner by his convincing arguments in favor of the moratorium. It would be interesting to know how U.S. propaganda is trying to get around this? What are its arguments in defense of the nuclear explosions?

[Dadyants] To be frank, this is being done rather clumsily. As you know, to begin with it was claimed that the United States was allegedly "lagging" behind the USSR in nuclear tests and that it had to catch up. However, this claim is totally at variance with the facts. In 1985, for instance, the United States carried out around 20 nuclear explosions, while the USSR carried out only 9 explosions prior to the introduction of the moratorium, and 2 of those were for peaceful purposes. In all the United States has carried out around 800 tests, which is more than the number of nuclear tests carried out by all other nuclear powers together and one-third more than the number of tests carried out by the Soviet Union.

When the argument about "lagging" failed, they came up with another, namely that the tests were essential for the United States to check the reliability of existing nuclear devices. However, this argument was quickly rejected by military experts: Existing nuclear weapons do not require any checking, they are constantly kept "in working order," in other words "they cannot get rusty."

But since there is no lag and no checking, then what? There remains only one conclusion: The United States needs the tests to create new types of nuclear arms, including so-called "third generation" weapons. However, it does not want to admit this openly because this would result in the United States' appearing in a very unfavorable light before the world public.

[Khudyakov] Do we know what types of weapons the Americans are testing in Nevada?

[Dadyants] Military experts are unanimous on this question. First, flight tests of the new MX missile are currently being carried out in the United States and new, more powerful warheads with even more accurate guidance systems are needed for that missile. Second, several types of warheads for the smaller Midgetman missile are being developed [razrabatyvayutsya]. Third, tests are needed to create new warheads for the sea-launched Trident-2 missiles. Fourth, work is under way on warheads for the next generation of strategic missiles. Fifth, new types of neutron warheads primarily for artillery and the so-called "operational-tactical" missiles are being tested. And, sixth, last but not least in significance, work is underway in Nevada on testing nuclear-pumped X-ray lasers and the transformation of nuclear explosions into other forms of energy to hit various targets in space--in other words on the implementation of the "star wars" program.

In short, the U.S. Administration is by no means carrying out nuclear explosions in Nevada to check old nuclear devices but rather to improve and create new types of nuclear and space weapons.

[Khudyakov] The Americans have detonated 19 nuclear devices, yet they have announced only 15 of them. Consequently, four tests including the latest were secret. How did we manage to detect them?

[Dadyants] At the present time it is impossible to conduct "secret" explosions. Even the lowest-yield explosions are immediately registered by national verification [proverka] means. As you know, a group of U.S. scientists is currently working near Semipalatinsk, recording not only the silence at our nuclear testing grounds but also the American explosions in Nevada.

[Khudyakov] But if we can detect their tests, does this not mean that the U.S. Administration's argument about "verification" [kontrol] crumbles?

[Dadyants] Indeed, it is yet another argument in favor of the feasibility of effective verification [kontrol] of all nuclear explosions. The USSR, let me recall, is prepared to agree to all types of verification [kontrol] up to and including on-site inspections. Meanwhile the United States continues to describe "verification" as an obstacle to the conclusion of an agreement. Quite recently, Regan, the White House chief of staff, said something to the effect that the United States is not against a treaty on a total and comprehensive ban on nuclear tests but that it is against the

conclusion of such a treaty "without a proper verification [kontrol] system." So where is the problem, Mr Reagan? We are prepared to agree to verification, but is the United States prepared to end its explosions under proper verification, including international verification [kontrol]? It appears that it is not. The White House spokesman Speakes declared openly that ending the tests "does not accord with U.S. security interests." So that the problem is not verification [kontrol] but a lack of political will on the part of the U.S. leaders.

[Khudyakov] Is there any hope that the Americans will nonetheless heed the voice of reason and agree to end tests and join the moratorium declared by the Soviet Union? Or are they a hopeless case?

[Dadyants] It was mentioned in the U.S. press that the United States intends to carry out a total of 100 explosions in order to implement the "program" outlined by the Pentagon. The military-industrial complex has a vested interest in the new round of nuclear arms race and will, of course, do everything in its power to prevent an agreement being reached. However, it is obvious that public opinion, including public opinion in the United States itself, cannot be ignored. According to opinion polls 80 percent of Americans favor ending the nuclear tests. The U.S. House of Representatives has voted in favor of ending nuclear tests with yields over 1 kiloton. This resolution provoked a stormy reaction from the administration. The White House declared that the Congress was jeopardizing U.S. "security." In other words, a struggle is being waged around the problem of ending nuclear tests. It is difficult to tell how it will end.

M.S. Gorbachev in his 18 August statement said that it might be possible to sign an agreement on ending nuclear tests in the course of the upcoming Soviet-American summit. We will have to wait and see what baggage the U.S. leaders are preparing for that meeting.

[Khudyakov] Is the long silence at the Soviet nuclear testing grounds not fraught with a threat to our country's security? After all, the Americans have been testing nuclear weapons for more than a year now while we have not.

[Dadyants] The decision to extend the moratorium has not been easy for us, of course, and M.S. Gorbachev openly said so in his statement. There is a certain price to pay. However, the political effect gained from extending the moratorium considerably outweighs this price. Just look at the situation which is developing. The Soviet moratorium has the support of the socialist countries, the communist parties, the nonaligned movement, the leaders of the "Delhi Six," public organizations, trade unions, many Western political parties including the West German Social Democrats and the British Laborites, and prominent scientists and cultural figures throughout the world. It would be much easier to name those who did not support this step of ours than those who approved it.

Now that security can be ensured only by political rather than military and technical means, the Soviet moratorium is a most important factor in the creation of a system of international security. "By our actions and initiatives we seek to strengthen peoples' hope that the situation can be changed, that there is a feasible alternative to confrontation," M.S. Gorbachev emphasized in his replies to the questions put by Z. Horeni, chief editor of RUDE PRAVO.

The year without explosions at Soviet nuclear testing grounds is a political and military reality rather than propaganda. The trend toward reason and common sense is actually present in international politics thanks to the Soviet moratorium. Meanwhile those who continue the nuclear explosions in Nevada are undermining both reason and common sense.

'Breakthrough Seen Possible'

PM131309 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Sep 86 First Edition p 4

[Academician Ye. Primakov "Topic of the Day": "The Moratorium's Universality. Thoughts on the Political and Military Effectiveness of Halting Nuclear Tests"]

[Text] There are military political decisions which play a fundamental role in giving rise to new trends and opening up fundamentally new paths for the development of the international situation. The Soviet leadership's decision to extend the nuclear test moratorium to 1 January 1987 is certainly one such. The USSR took it upon itself to halt these tests in a situation where the United States is continuing its nuclear explosions at the test site in Nevada. It was no easy decision for the Soviet side. But it was done. It was done with due consideration, not impulsively and not under the influence of any short-term considerations of expediency, as is made clear once again by M.S. Gorbachev's answers to the newspaper RUDE PRAVO's questions.

A New Approach

The Soviet Union's unilateral cessation of nuclear tests is the practical implementation of the foreign policy line outlined at the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and given its final form in the 27th Party Congress materials. The CPSU proclaimed that the only way out of the rigid military confrontation, which could result in a lethal explosion for the whole of human civilization, is new approaches to relations between states, and these approaches demand new political thinking. One of the main elements in this thinking is renunciation of attempts to acquire a military advantage over the opposing side as a means of safeguarding one's own security. In other words, a very important conclusion was drawn to the effect that given the present level and real prospects of scientific and technical advances in the military area it would be unwise to rely entirely on military methods of safeguarding security. Political means are needed above all.

Positive ideas acquire real value only when they are given material form. The best way to do this is by example — the ability to put one's own ideas into practice. The USSR has demonstrated this ability. The creation of a substantial opportunity for an accord with the United States on halting nuclear tests, in our view, outweighs the cost the USSR has deliberately borne in extending the moratorium for the fourth time. It should

be noted in particular that it is a question of an accord that takes into account the need for reliable verification [kontrol] of its implementation. No one is suggesting merely that tests should stop, as certain Western opponents of a moratorium would have it. The halting of tests is meant to ensure the commencement of talks and success in achieving a verifiable treaty-based ban on nuclear tests.

Breakthrough

The USSR's decision on an 18-month unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests is a proposal to the United States to accomplish a **BREAKTHROUGH** [capitalized passages published in boldface] in political thinking in the chief military area. The halting of nuclear tests is geared to curtailing a very dangerous present-day process — the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons. Moreover, it is a **UNIVERSAL** measure in the disarmament sphere which can simultaneously limit the development of all nuclear systems — strategic, medium-range, and operation-tactical. [paragraph continues]

In addition to that a test ban is the quickest and most radical of all the currently feasible arms limitation steps: it avoids a large number of problems connected with technical, strategic, geostrategic, and political imbalances.

It must also be said that the cessation of nuclear tests can play an important part in nuclear nonproliferation, and this problem is becoming an increasingly urgent one. As is known, a substantial number of countries is seeking to create nuclear weapons. The danger is aggravated by the fact that these countries (for example, Israel, South Africa, Pakistan, and South Korea) are threatening their neighbors and are actively involved in regional conflicts. Their reaching the "nuclear mark" may not only pose a serious and direct threat to a number of neighboring states, but also make the world situation even more unstable and, perhaps, spark off a nuclear conflagration.

The Political Aspect

Furthermore, the cessation of nuclear tests can lead to a change in the world social and political climate more effectively than any other immediate, one-shot measure. It can confidently be predicted that in the event of a Soviet-American accord the atmosphere will be right for considerably greater trust between the two countries and this will have very great, even decisive importance in the creation of a favorable climate for resolving dangerous regional conflicts — in the Near East, west and south Asia, Central America, and Africa.

The USSR's decision to extend the nuclear test moratorium, a product of the new political thinking, takes into maximum consideration the sentiments and opinions of politicians, scientists, specialists, and broad strata of the population in various countries. But when switching to the new political thinking it is necessary to take into account the growing role of public opinion in all parts of the world.

During M.S. Gorbachev's 14 July 1986 meeting with the participants of the Moscow international scientists' conference major scientific figures from the United States, Britain, Italy, France, Japan, and Sweden appealed to the CPSU Central Committee general secretary to extend the moratorium. A similar appeal was made to the Soviet and U.S. leaders by the "Delhi Six" (Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden). Public opinion polls in the United States also show a trend toward an increasing percentage of opponents of nuclear tests. The fact that the Soviet moratorium, despite having been ignored initially by the U.S. press, subsequently, as it was repeatedly extended, acquired a widespread reputation and popularity is no insignificant factor in this.

The Role of the Public

Even when they are protecting their own specific interests, the leaders of the capitalist world cannot turn a blind eye to the importance of public opinion in the elaboration of political decisions. So they try to manipulate it. The consideration of public opinion as a very important factor capable of influencing policy and the desire to prevent malicious manipulation of the public are an essential ingredient of our approach to international affairs. And this has proved its worth.

It is possible to construct a chain of cause and effect: The Soviet Union extends its moratorium four times — this considerably undermines the myths of the "Soviet military threat" and of the "propaganda nature of Soviet foreign policy initiatives — a shift in public opinion in the United States, other NATO countries, and Japan — a certain difference of opinion between the United States and a number of its allies concerning the possibility of compromises vis-a-vis the USSR — a slight shift in the positions of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives on questions connected with talks with the USSR, including those on halting nuclear tests.

The chain lacks the final link — a change in the U.S. Administration's stance. But it can be concluded that irrespective of whether it goes along with the USSR's proposal on banning all nuclear explosions, prefers to hold talks on lowering the threshold, simulates movement, or generally marks time it will be under mounting pressure. But the U.S. Administration already has less room for maneuver than before. To all appearances, this is bound to affect the atmosphere of the next presidential elections in the United States to some extent.

Their "Arguments"

In his replies to the RUDE PRAVO chief editor the CPSU Central Committee general secretary gave a vivid account of the whole range of aspirations which gave rise to the fierce opposition to a nuclear test ban and conducted a most convincing expose of the pseudoarguments used by the champions of nuclear rivalry. Washington has already tried out a whole series of "arguments" against the Soviet proposal to join the moratorium. First it was fictitious problems of verification [kontrol] and then, when the USSR had clearly demonstrated that they in fact do not exist, it was forced to switch to arguments about links between the continuation of nuclear tests and security for the United States and its allies. And the U.S. military are putting forward the thesis that tests are important not only for the qualitative development of nuclear weapons and the switch to other systems, in particular implementation of the "star wars" (SDI) program, but also as a means of checking the combat capability of existing nuclear armaments. But whereas tests actually are needed in order to qualitatively improve nuclear weapons, they are not essential to check existing nuclear warheads, according to the authoritative opinion of leading U.S., other Western, and Soviet scientists. Consequently, when they insist on the continuation of nuclear tests, U.S. politicians and military men are in fact talking not about security, which is based on maintaining strategic military parity with the USSR, but about efforts to overcome it and achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union.

It must be said too that the very refusal by the United States to halt nuclear weapon tests refutes more convincingly than any effort of logic the thesis of official Washington military policy that the United States is seeking to deliver mankind from nuclear weapons — a thesis they use in the attempt to validate the SDI program, which is in fact geared to obtaining a first nuclear strike potential.

We are living in a nuclear-space era, an interrelated, albeit contradictory world. In these conditions the time for making decisions is extremely limited and quickly passes. Realization of this fact not only by the Soviet Union, but by the United States and all other states is meant to pave the way to new political thinking without which mankind would probably be condemning itself to the slippery slope.

Weinberger View 'Absurd'

PM121111 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Sep 86 First Edition p 5

[Correspondent V. Gan "Rejoinder": "The Secretary and the Cannon"]

[Text] Washington — Sober-mindedness has never been one of U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger's strong points. [paragraph continues]

In fact, the absence of this quality has often been so marked that it has compelled local journalists to compare the Pentagon chief to a "loose cannon on deck," which could burst through the timbers of its own ship in the event of a storm. It is a very apt comparison and, alas, applicable still. It was apparent to readers of THE DALLAS MORNING NEWS on reading an interview with Weinberger the other day. And what he said was absolute rubbish.

For example, what about the Pentagon chief's "subtle hint" that "agents of Moscow," no less, are supposedly ensconced in the U.S. Congress and are implementing a "Soviet agenda"? What is Weinberger actually referring to? "The recommendations in favor of banning nuclear tests, which are essential for determining the effectiveness of the armaments we are forced to rely on," "the sharp reduction in the funds necessary for the development of reliable strategic defenses" (that is, the implementation of the "star wars" program), the ban on testing antisatellite weapons...

Obviously, these steps by the U.S. legislators are murder for the Pentagon. Common sense goes out of the window when the pet creations of the military-industrial complex, which is not accustomed to foregoing its pleasures, are under threat.

But the Pentagon leader thought it wise to keep quiet about the military-industrial complex. Instead, he dredged up the old tale about the Soviet Union's allegedly sitting down at the negotiating table only because "we have built up our military might to a massive degree." In other words, according to Weinberger's logic, the USSR has been guided not by a sincere desire to halt the arms race but by some kind of 'fear' of the United States.

This is patently absurd. Especially as the secretary himself did not bother to conceal the reasons that made him turn inside out. "It is very important not to relinquish the many advantages obtained as a result of acquiring substantial military might -- we have not yet finished the job," he said.

Weinberger was asked whether there was a possibility of achieving Soviet-American agreements on arms control. "I believe that the Soviet Union wants agreements on arms reductions," he admitted. And the administration? The secretary's reply was accompanied by a proviso: Washington wants agreements which would in no way limit or hamper the "orderly development [razrabotka] of strategic defenses." That is, give the Pentagon a license to militarize space and everything will be fine!

Remember the comparison to a "loose cannon"...

Defense Ministry Expert

PM120921 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Sep 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Colonel V.L. Kotyuzhanskiy, "USSR Defense Ministry Expert," by correspondent B. Ivanov: "Tests of Historical Maturity"]

[Text] Colonel V.L. Kotyuzhanskiy, USSR Defense Ministry expert on questions of banning nuclear weapon tests, recently visited the United States. IZVESTIYA's correspondent met him and asked him to answer some questions.

[Ivanov] Vitaliy Lukich, what was the purpose of your trip?

[Kotyuzhanskiy] Part of my task was to explain the essence of our decision to extend the moratorium: In Washington and New York, at press conferences organized by the USSR Embassy and the Soviet UN Mission, and in meetings with correspondents of leading American newspapers including THE WASHINGTON POST and THE NEW YORK TIMES.

[Ivanov] THE WASHINGTON POST admitted not so long ago that nuclear tests are "the ignition key to the entire arms race: You have only to turn that key and the motor will die." The Republican administration has so far refused to stop the motor of its militarist preparations. Have any changes become apparent, in your view, in the White House's position on the moratorium?

[Kotyuzhanskiy] Unfortunately, we cannot yet speak of any change in the American position. The United States continues to respond to our peace initiatives with explosions in Nevada. Washington's actions are beginning to frighten people more and more. And its attitude to the moratorium on nuclear explosions, as M.S. Gorbachev pointed out in his replies to the RUDE PRAVO chief editor's questions, exposes the real essence and thrust of its policy. This is a test of the U.S. Administration's historical maturity.

The White House is engaged in compiling "arguments" of various kinds to justify Washington's refusal to subscribe to the moratorium.

Let us recall that as long ago as 18 August, that is, on the day our moratorium was extended, White House Deputy Press Secretary L. Speakes declared: "The Soviet Union had carried out a considerable modernization of its nuclear forces before it announced this moratorium. We have not yet finished realizing our response to their modernization by modernizing our forces." Naturally, Speakes did not adduce any proof of this. Why? Because there is none and can be none. The facts indicate the reverse: The United States is the champion in terms of the number of nuclear explosions. It has carried out more of them than all the other nuclear powers put together. It has carried out 50 percent more than the Soviet Union. And throughout the years of testing the United States has led both in terms of the number of explosions in each individual environment (in the atmosphere, under water, and underground) and in terms of their number at any period of time. Over the past 5-10 years, for example, the United States has systematically outstripped the USSR by almost one-third in terms of the number of nuclear tests. During the year of our moratorium a further 18 nuclear devices have been exploded in Nevada (and the teleprinters recently reported a new nuclear explosion in the United States). So, the discrepancy in the number of tests in the U.S. favor has increased still further. These are the statistics. There is no question of any Washington "lag."

[Ivanov] To judge from press reports, appreciable nervousness now reigns in the American capital, and contradictory arguments are being advanced in favor of the United States' continuing nuclear explosions. The White House has announced its intention to keep nuclear weapons in "the foreseeable future." That statement virtually cancels out the U.S. president's solemn declarations at the Soviet-American meeting in Geneva, where the two countries' leaders confirmed their intention to strive to end the nuclear arms race on the earth and to prevent it in space.

[Kotlyuzhanskiy] Yes, on coming up against American political reality, you see for yourself that Washington displays a manner of thinking which has long lagged hopelessly behind the process of profound changes in international life. [paragraph continues]

People there resort again and again to the myth of the "Soviet military threat" in order to conceal from Americans the real reasons for the present administration's policy and its desire to upset the established equilibrium of forces in the U.S. favor. This is precisely the aim of the numerous programs to create [sozdaniye] new kinds of nuclear weapons.

Another nuance is also curious. Whereas previously the United States always cited the problem of verification [kontrol] as the sole argument against concluding a treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, now, after a whole series of corresponding Soviet initiatives (the Soviet press has written a lot about them, and in detail), that trump card can no longer be "played." So the administration has had to urgently draw up a new "rejection formula." President Reagan declared in the report sent to Congress 14 August, in particular, that a nuclear test ban should be viewed "in context with the time when the need to rely on the nuclear deterrent recedes...and when we achieve profound, extensive, improve the potential for carrying out verification [proverka], extend confidence-building measures, and achieve greater balance in conventional arms and armed forces." In other words, it is clear that the resolution of the question of ending nuclear tests is being postponed indefinitely, until the "Greek calends," as the saying goes.

[Ivanov] By the time the Soviet Union extended the moratorium, the United States had conducted 18 nuclear explosions but had only announced 15. Three tests were not officially reported. What kind of explosions were they, and how were they recorded?

[Kotlyuzhanskiy] During press conferences American journalists repeatedly touched on the question of those three explosions, emphasizing that the USSR had detected them solely with the help of its own national technical means of verification [kontrol] -- seismic stations which record ground vibrations or seismic waves which spread throughout the planet after a nuclear explosion, as well as with the help of space satellites. The American press later reported that the nuclear devices in question had been exploded in Nevada 15 August 1985, at the end of October 1985, and 20 April 1986. Their yield was low. The sum total of the circumstances of their detonation gives grounds for assuming that they were carried out within the framework of work on creating [sozdaniye] space arms. This viewpoint was express to American reporters who then literally bombarded the Pentagon and other competent federal departments with questions about this. In the end, seeking to break through such a siege by journalists, the administration was forced to confirm the facts that three nuclear tests, which it had previously hushed up, had been conducted. As for the purpose of the explosions in the Nevada desert, the administration continues to keep quiet about this.

[Ivanov] You have touched on the problem of verification [kontrol]. The Soviet side has repeatedly demonstrated that this problem does not exist at all. Incidentally, the fact that our specialists recorded three explosions not announced by Washington attests to the reliability of national means of verification [kontrol]. And the Americans undoubtedly possess corresponding means that are in no way inferior to ours.

[Kotyuzhanskiy] The United States not only possesses modern technical means of verification [kontrol] but also has a definite advantage in that area, since it obtains seismic information from almost 200 monitoring [kontrolnyy] stations located in various parts of the world, including along the perimeter of our borders. The Soviet Union's territory is fully "covered" by such stations. [paragraph continues]

According to American scientists themselves, the threshold for the detection of underground nuclear explosions on Soviet territory by such seismic devices is far below a yield of 1 kiloton. As you see, both our own and the American national means are perfectly adequate for effectively verifying [kontrol] the ending of nuclear tests.

In addition, the Soviet Union has expressed readiness to reach agreement also on international inspection [proverka] measures, including taking advantage of the proposal of the "Delhi Six" countries to set up special stations on their territory to observe fulfillment of the corresponding accord on ending tests. In the event of the United States' subscribing to the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions, the USSR is also ready to reach agreement on on-site verification [kontrol] measures. The setting up of an American seismic apparatus in the Semipalatinsk region within the framework of the experiment involving Soviet and U.S. scientists clearly shows the Soviet side's readiness for any constructive steps in the area of inspections [proverki] of the absence of nuclear tests.

And another thing. Following the press conference that I gave at the Soviet Embassy in Washington, THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote: "...The administration believes that verification [kontrol] is not the key problem. But it has declared that the United States will not undertake to end tests even if the problems of verification [kontrol] are solved, since tests are needed to create [sozdaniye] new types of nuclear warheads...." In other words, the White House has been forced to acknowledge the invalidity of its basic argument, which it has long used to cover up a lack of political will in the matter of banning nuclear explosions.

[Ivanov] And a last question. These days the editorial office receives many letters in which readers ask whether our country's security is threatened by the silence on the Soviet nuclear test sites, while tests of American nuclear weapons are continuing in Nevada.

[Kotyuzhanskiy] American journalists put this question in a somewhat different form -- to what extent has the moratorium affected the state of Soviet nuclear programs? You will, of course, remember that, on commencing its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions 6 August 1985, the Soviet Union was forced to suspend its test programs. Subsequently, without corresponding nuclear tests, we were naturally unable to conduct work on improving our arms. But the country's security is our sacred cause. There are limits beyond which the USSR will not go, because it cannot forego its own security and that of its allies.

We still must not harbor any illusions about the Republican administration's position. However, the international realities of today must sooner or later impinge on the consciousness of the inhabitants of Washington's political Mount Olympus. At least, we would like to hope so.

World Opinion Cited

PM141238 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Sep 86 First Edition p 4

[Political observer Vsevolod Ovchinnikov article under the general heading "Constructive Dialogue Needed": "Touchstone"]

[Text] On the day PRAVDA published M.S. Gorbachev's replies to questions from Z. Horeni, chief editor of RUDE PRAVO, I was flying back to Moscow from Harare. Consequently the ideas expressed in that document were added to my impressions of the nonaligned countries' forum, highlighting the indissoluble connection between the right to life and the right to development.

The arms race must be curbed, both to preserve life on the planet and to put an end to poverty and backwardness — such was the main theme of the conference in the Zimbabwean capital. To prevent mankind's destruction as a result of nuclear war — this is a question which must be resolved, otherwise the posing of all other questions becomes senseless, R. Mugabe, the nonaligned movement's chairman, stated. He recalled that just one-fifth of the total annual military spending in the world would be enough to completely end hunger on our planet before the end of the century.

The leaders of almost 100 states who assembled in Harare welcomed the Soviet moratorium and urged Washington to follow Moscow's example. The idea was clearly expressed from the conference platform that the ending of nuclear explosions is not just a declaration but an action, and that the Soviet moratorium, extended now for the fourth time, is a political and military reality and evidence of the fact that the trend toward reason and common sense, a trend which can and must be consolidated, actually exists in world politics.

The mood at the nonaligned countries' conference illustrates the change which has taken place in world public opinion under the influence of the Soviet initiatives. The arguments in favor of going on with explosions have faded and withered like a fig leaf, revealing the opponents of the moratorium in all their ugly political nakedness.

Who will agree that the joint ending of tests cannot be verified if U.S. specialists are allowed to install their seismographs around the Soviet test range in Semipalatinsk (where, moreover, the only tremors recorded are those in Nevada), when Soviet scientists can detect from their territory even those U.S. explosions which the Pentagon does not want to announce?

Who will believe that the United States is forced to catch the Soviet Union up in modernizing its arsenals when it has already conducted more tests than all the other nuclear powers put together? (This is shown particularly graphically by the example of recent years: The USSR carried out 9 explosions in 1985 prior to the moratorium, the United States carried out 12. For more than 1 year now silence has reigned at the Soviet test ranges while in Nevada the number of tests in the same period is close to 20.)

Who will believe that you cannot be sure of the reliability of the existing arsenals without continuing tests? It is clear even to a nonspecialist that nuclear explosive is not some perishable product and that explosions are completely unnecessary to verify the other components. No words can conceal the main aim of the tests, which is glaringly obvious. It is to develop [razrabotka] new types of armaments. (paragraph continues)

Space-based nuclear weapons — X-ray lasers with so-called nuclear triggers — are being created [sozdavatsy]. Work is under way on preparing a completely new weapon, capable of striking targets both on earth and in space. Therefore, to claim that the ending of explosions will do nothing for the cause of nuclear disarmament is a hypocritical lie.

Hardly anyone will be fooled by the attempts to play off one side against the other: The argument is that the two powers had already "almost" agreed on a radical reduction of nuclear armaments when the Soviet moratorium interfered. That is not how matters are all all. Despite the USSR's efforts the sides have not moved an inch closer to an arms reduction agreement since the Geneva meeting. The U.S. Administration's actions have been in the opposite direction. There is the acceleration of the SDI and the other steps which undermine the ABM Treaty. There is the statement on withdrawing from the SALT II Treaty. There are the latest predatory "neoglobalist" actions against Libya, Nicaragua, and other countries. And there are the military maneuvers close to the Soviet Union — from the North Sea and the Baltic to the Far East — maneuvers unprecedented since the fifties.

In brief then, Washington has no convincing reason for refusing to join the Soviet moratorium — other than to admit that bellicose imperialist circles need nuclear explosions to upset military-strategic parity; and that they are being conducted to create a qualitatively new weapon with which the White House hopes to wage and plans to win a nuclear war — despite declarations on the impossibility of the former and the latter.

The attitude to nuclear tests is a touchstone on which the real essence and purpose of a nuclear state's foreign policy are judged. Those who strive for military superiority and who want to continue the arms race and extend it to space do not need a moratorium. A moratorium is a hindrance to those who are desperate for new, more sophisticated types of weapons, who profess the rule of force and who customarily resort to blackmail and diktat. A moratorium is unacceptable to those who fear honest competition with another social system in the sphere of the economy, democracy, and culture. Nuclear explosions are continued by those who do not care what happens to nature or to people's environment and for who the profits of the manufacturers of death are more important than the opinions and vital interests of hundreds of millions of people throughout the world.

Herein lie the reasons for the anxious silence with which Washington official circles greeted the new Soviet document. The Soviet leader's replies to the Czechoslovak newspaper and the facts and arguments that they contain are simply being ignored. And like so many times before, attempts are being made to divert public attention with some artificially exaggerated ballyhoo.

Washington surely does not lack experience of manipulating public opinion. Only on this occasion it will not succeed in fooling anyone. The attitude to a full ban on nuclear explosions has become in our day the most convincing indication of political leaders' approach to disarmament, international security, and the cause of peace. This is a particular test of historic maturity. And the Washington administration must take that test before the gaze of all mankind.

3 October 1986

'Daniloff Affair' Distracts from Offer

LD121652 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 12 Sep 86

[Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] The latest explosion in Nevada is the 20th test of the U.S. atomic weapons since the Soviet moratorium began. I repeat, the 20th, for Washington has its own statistics according to which they attempt to conceal some of the explosions. As we can see, however, nothing comes of this. Scientists accurately record in any case the faintest rumbling in Nevada's underground galleries. In this way, each explosion, whether announced or not, clearly refutes Washington's statements to the effect that it is allegedly impossible to monitor a moratorium on nuclear tests.

Incidentally, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted in his answers to the questions from RUDE PRAVO, one might think of creating an international supranational network for monitoring a test cessation. Washington's statements about explosions being allegedly essential for checking the reliability of already existing nuclear arsenals do not bear out criticism. This can be done just as effectively and far more cheaply and safely by other methods. If the Americans have doubts about this our specialists, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev observed, are willing to share their secrets with them. But it is not really a matter of any kinds of secrets here: the Pentagon needs more and more nuclear explosions to create new types of weapons, above all, weapons for basing in space. Naturally however, it is not easy to declare this openly, taking into account the feelings of the world public, including those of the U.S. public itself. So Washington is thinking up all kinds of excuses and seeking all sorts of pretexts in order to avoid accepting the Soviet proposal to end nuclear tests.

The so-called Daniloff affair is being used as one of these pretexts: Daniloff is a U.S. correspondent who has been detained in Moscow after being caught red-handed carrying out activities bearing no relation to journalism. In itself, this incident is fairly commonplace, particularly since even Durenberger, chairman of the Senate Committee on Intelligence, has admitted that the U.S. Secret Services make fairly broad use of journalists for their purposes. Nonetheless, an incredible hullabaloo is being whipped up in the United States over the Daniloff affair with the obvious aim of distracting attention from the USSR's peace initiatives and, above all, from our moratorium. But this, after all, once again confirms that Washington has no genuine counterarguments.

U.S. Arguments Rebutted

AU151419 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 12 Sep 86 p 6

[Article by Colonel Vasilii Morozov, "Laureate of the USSR State Prize, APN Military Observer," written especially for RABOTNICHESKO DELO: "Truth and Lies About the Blasts"]

[Text] The declaration by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee of 18 August, continues to focus the attention of the world public. For the fourth time the USSR has announced that it extends its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests until 1 January 1987. This is further proof of the adherence of socialism, as a progressive social system, to the cause of peace. This is also a concrete action on the part of the USSR aimed at nuclear disarmament and liquidating nuclear weapons on earth.

Will the United States support this Soviet peace-loving step? Will it respond to the insistent appeal of the Soviet state to stop nuclear testing and turn the moratorium into a bilateral one, so that afterwards a treaty on fully stopping and banning these tests can be signed? One could say that these questions move the world's entire peace-loving public. It is clear to all that if the United States eventually takes this wise step, then the problem of nuclear tests will be solved forever, and will take its place on the shelves of history.

Unfortunately, throughout the entire period of the moratorium the official representatives of the White House and the Pentagon used and continue to use false arguments to justify in the eyes of the world public their unwillingness to join the moratorium.

The true emptiness of the U.S. "arguments" becomes clear as soon as one asks: Can the USSR be less concerned with its own security and the security of its allies than the United States? Every sober-minded person understands that this is not so. Nevertheless, the USSR considered it possible to halt its nuclear tests, repeatedly extending the term of its unilateral moratorium, and consistently and insistently striving to resume the negotiations on working out an international treaty on the total and general ban on experiments with nuclear weapons. As Mikhail Gorbachev stressed in his RUDE PRAVO interview, the attitude toward the moratorium reveals the real essence and direction of policy.

How does the United States respond? As before it tries to find a manner of diverting the solution of the issue, and continues to intensively implement the program of nuclear experiments set for this year. As early as 16 December 1985 the U.S. magazine U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT very correctly noted in connection with the falsehood of the "argument" of the American strategists that the security of the nuclear potential must be guaranteed: "If no nuclear test were conducted in the United States in the next 100 years, we would still have 10 times more secure nuclear warheads than necessary for the extermination of this community" (meaning the socialist countries V.M.).

From a military-Technical point of view, at the present time there is no need to check the reliability of nuclear warheads through blasts. There are other means -- hydraulic-dynamic, through mathematical models, through an objective analysis of the data supplied by telemetric measurements, and so forth. The essence of the issue is that in 90 of 100 cases the nuclear tests are necessary in order to create new types and kinds of weapons.

By the end of 1985 the United States introduced into production eight types of new nuclear warheads. It is every clear that precisely this is the reason for the "argument" that is ostensibly connected with the concern with the reliability of the nuclear potential.

Also the thesis of the White House, that the USSR had significantly left the United States behind in the sphere of the tests, cannot be defended against criticism. The facts show that for the period of 16 July 1945 to 1 January 1986 the United States has conducted more nuclear blasts (810) than all other nuclear states put together -- USSR -- 563; France -- 135; Great Britain -- 38; and China -- 29. The number of tests conducted by the USSR and the United States in the previous 10 years (until 1985), is approximately equal -- 150 each, or 15-16 per year. At the same time, under Reagan's administration, the United States has tested 40 percent more nuclear charges than the USSR. At the same time, as the BALTIMORE SUN pointed out, the Pentagon has used data obtained from the 38 nuclear tests of its closest ally -- Great Britain. On the other hand, the U.S. plan is to conduct 16 tests until the end of 1986, while the program for the next 10 years envisages almost 1,000 blasts, with the view to work out the star wars technology.

The tales told in the West about the issue of verification are traditionally numerous. They present this issue as a reliable "brake" always when there is even a hint about bringing the positions closer together, or approaching an agreement. Simultaneously, the efforts do not cease to create in the public the impression that it is precisely the United States and its allies who support, and the USSR who opposes, verification, and that namely the "open position" of the West encounters an obstacle -- the "closed position" of the East.

The Soviet proposal to stop underground nuclear tests envisaged the use of various verification measures, both national and international, excluding any possibility of secretly evading the obligations undertaken. Therefore, Reagan's administration was forced to admit that essentially the allusions to the "necessity of effective means of ratification" as precondition for ratifying the previously signed treaties, and reaching new agreements, are nothing but excuses. Furthermore, the total ban on nuclear tests encounters political and not technical difficulties, because the present U.S. position in the military area aims at continuing the nuclear arms race. The USSR is convinced more than ever before that, given the modern level of technical means of verification, everything depends on the good will of the states to reach concrete results in limiting the arms race. Practical means of verification, as Mikhail Gorbachev repeatedly stressed, can always be coordinated.

Among the statements of the opponents of the moratorium one can also encounter the argument that it contributes very little to the general plan of nuclear disarmament. Naturally, this is another falsehood. If the USSR limited itself only to the moratorium, then its role would not have been very significant. However, the USSR proposed the moratorium only as the first step -- which can be easily implemented from a technical and political points of view -- that is necessary for stopping the nuclear conveyor belt. The next step would lead toward totally stopping nuclear tests under international control. Without new tests one cannot perfect the old weapons, nor create new ones. The banning of tests, stressed Mikhail Gorbachev in one of his statements, would mean the creation of a strong barrier on the road of further increasing the weapons of mass destruction.

Moscow Radio Talk Show

LD121826 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 12 Sep 86

[International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by foreign political commentator Vyacheslav Lavrentyev; with political observer Vladimir Shishlin, station commentator Yevgeniy Grachev, commentator Pavel Kasparov, station correspondent in New York Vladimir Zvyagin, and "colleague" Sergey Pravdin]

[Excerpt] [Lavrentyev] We start today's program with replies to letters which raise the problem of war and peace and the search for ways of curbing the arms race. Many listeners are quite right to link the solving of these problems with the need above all to normalize Soviet-U.S. relations. Letters from Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Tyutrin from Orekhovo-Zuyevo, Comrade Kochetov from L'viv and others voice indignation at the obstructionist position of the Reagan administration toward our specific peaceful proposals and its unwillingness to be accommodating toward our initiatives. To judge by Washington's unfavorable reaction to our gesture of good will -- the extension of the moratorium on nuclear blasts -- writes Comrade Voronina from Moscow, the U.S. Administration is not interested in achieving a stable peace on earth. In that case,

is it worth having anything to do with it at all, she asks? I will ask political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin to reply to this and a number of other questions. Over to you, Nikolay Vladimirovich.

[Shishlin] These are of course serious letters, and serious matters are raised in them. It is not just Soviet people that are pondering these matters, but people in other countries also. But all the same, there are no simple answers to these questions, or rather there are no simplistic answers. If one were to adopt toward the present administration the stance that one cannot get on with it and that all that can be done is to wait for the next U.S. presidential election — to which almost 2 and 1/2 years remain — such a stance could not of course in any sense be called an active one. It is true, of course, that when we look, at the seventies, the foreign policy baggage of the seventies, we see that despite the fact that the U.S. Administrations were not very obliging during this period either, the 1972 treaty, or more precisely the interim agreement, on the limitation of strategic armaments was worked out, the ABM treaty of indefinite duration was concluded, and the SALT II agreement was worked out, though not ratified by the U.S. Senate. But during the 6 years in which the present U.S. Administration has been in office there has simply been no baggage containing any sort of agreement; there has been nothing. But they have destroyed quite a lot.

What should be done? People naturally raise questions over the fact that the Soviet Union takes initiatives and puts forward various ideas — compromise proposals, I might add, which take account of the position of the other side and the security interests of the other side — while the U.S. Administration turns its back on these proposals. In particular, as far as the moratorium extension is concerned, as was noted by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorabachev, it has been declared that this is little short of propaganda. But this is propaganda by example, propaganda by concrete action, clear and comprehensible, and quite clearly directed toward halting the arms race and then going back to solve the cardinal problems which burden international reality today.

And now the question of whether it is worth having dealings with this U.S. Administration. It is unquestionably worth doing so. Yes, it is a hard-line administration, with all sorts of ideological prejudices, frequently in bellicose and militarist mood, and of course this defiant U.S. policy is lodged in the whole fabric of political and economic life of the United States today.

But to leave it at that and to consider that there is no common denominator in Soviet interests and U.S. interests would quite simply be incorrect. If nothing else, we have the common interest of working out how to survive, the need to survive, and not just to survive, but to learn to coexist peacefully, to learn to cooperate; and of course, mindful of its responsibility not just to our socialist friends but also to mankind, the Soviet Union must act responsibly, just as our state has acted throughout the already more than 8 months of 1986. Time is an asset which in the rapidly moving nuclear space age must be spent as economically as possible. Time must not be wasted. And that is why the active Soviet position — I do not want to say that it guarantees a new Soviet-U.S. summit in the near future — but this active Soviet position naturally fosters the smoothing out of Soviet-U.S. relations and an improvement of international relations as such.

[Lavrentyev] A number of letters, including one from (Peter Kuzmich Zavylov), a veteran of labor from Kemerovo, contain questions which boil down to the following. Don't Americans understand the full extent of the disastrous nature of the militarist course of their administration; why do they let Reagan pursue such a course?

[Shishlin] Well, there are of course different kinds of Americans. There are the people who are commonly labelled as ordinary Americans. There is the American political elite. And there is the military-industrial complex. And naturally different groups of the American population react in different ways both to Soviet actions and the actions of their own administration. I do not propose here to paint rosy pictures about the start of a change of mood in the United States. Regrettably, anti-Soviet stereotypes have become rather firmly lodged in the American consciousness. But something is nevertheless happening, something fairly perceptible. It is a fact, for instance, that when we first announced our unilateral moratorium, 3 or 4 months after the Soviet Union introduced its unilateral moratorium, if you had asked Americans whether they knew anything about it, it can almost be guaranteed that no one knew anything about it. It was simply hushed up. But now, when the Soviet Union has extended its unilateral moratorium for the fourth time, Americans knows the Soviet position.

Opinion polls show that roughly three-quarters of the American population wants nuclear tests banned. It is also noteworthy that the U.S. Congress, and in particular the House of Representatives, is quite officially calling on the U.S. Administration to agree to a moratorium on nuclear tests from 1 January 1987. Admittedly, it is not the same as our moratorium, it is not an absolute moratorium. They propose setting a threshold limiting the yield of nuclear warheads which are being — warheads would have to be less than 1 kiloton — and somehow to limit the number of blasts. Naturally this is not a radical solution to the problem, but this shows of course quite clearly that there has been a certain shift in the political awareness of even the U.S. House of Representatives. But there are also strong opponents. Of course the United States — and this is something that our listeners must be aware of — calculates that it will simply wear us out in the arms race, that it will exhaust the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. United States can force its way to military superiority and again the opportunity to orchestrate all developments on the world political scene exists.

Well, they naturally can not do this, but this situation is also a reality.

In other words, we are witnesses of a very bitter struggle in which the new thinking and the new approaches which have been so clearly announced by the Soviet Union are, with difficulty, breaking through the force of inertia and beginning to penetrate public awareness in other countries, including the awareness of the American public.

Foreign Journalists Round Table

LD132240 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 13 Sep 86

[Program titled: "The Main Topic Is the Soviet Moratorium," chaired by Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, All-Union Radio and Television political observer, with journalists Shah Rajiv, identified as Indian publicist; Jack Phillips, from THE CANADIAN TRIBUNE; Atanas Atanasov, from Bulgaria's RABOTNICHESKO DELO; and Yuriy Aleksandrovich (Gremitskiy), identified as the chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry press Center; date and place not given — recorded]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Zholkver] Yuriy Aleksandr [Gremitskiy], it's not my intention to make compliments but, press conferences have been held at the Zubovskaya [Zubovskaya Ploshchad, the location of the Foreign Ministry Press Center] on a great many issues which have been raised here, above all of course, issues related to our

moratorium, which you yourself have conducted. Unfortunately, I was far from able to attend all of them and I think that it would also be interesting for our radio listeners to learn which, in your view, were the most noteworthy questions posed, not only by those journalists who are present here but by others at these press conferences.

[Gremitskiy] Indeed, there have been a whole number of press conferences of late at which the representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and of the Ministry of Defense — that is politicians and military men and then specialists such as scientists and seismologists and many other specialists on the United States and its politics from the United States and Canada institute — outlined in a very orderly fashion our whole position and our stance in favor of a complete and universal ending of our tests.

The possibility was proved in a very clear, specific way at these press conferences of reliably monitoring the complete cessation of all nuclear explosions—even very small ones. Of course, in the handling, in those questions which journalists posed — the viewpoint of the particular journalist was revealed as was that of his press organ, television or radio station. The thrust of the social background which the journalist represents was also evident.

[Zholkver] As they say in English, who's who.

[Gremitskiy] Absolutely right, yes, and who is with whom. Let's say, well you are asking which were the interesting questions, but what was more interesting was the silence of the U.S. journalists. Particularly at the last press conference, the silence was so eloquent that, well, I won't assert that a direct stage-production is taking place as it were in the conduct of the U.S. journalists, but it is clear that at home they apparently don't charge them with throwing light on the position of the Soviet Union.

[Zholkver] Yuriy Aleksandrovich while you have been speaking I was thinking that we in radio and television are actually faced with similar phenomena. In particular we wanted to hold a routine telebridge with the participation of major Soviet politicians from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, military men and experts and with the participation on the other side, of U.S. representatives and here also we met with silence, although one of the U.S. television companies was willing to do this. But representatives of the U.S. State Department stated in particular that neither Shultz, the secretary of state, nor his closest colleagues would wish to take part in such a telebridge with the Soviet colleagues, referring as they did so to the principle of confidentiality. What do you think of this?

[Gremitskiy] Yes, well they are hiding behind a formal argument if one may call it thus, and I say if one may call it thus, because it is no argument: Talks are, of course, confidential. In these talks, the sides expound their positions and attempt to move toward each other, having perhaps some kind of fall-back positions. One aspect of politics, however, is that these days it is impossible to just isolate somewhere, to cross out some where — because public opinion, the peoples throughout the world, want to know what kind of policy their governments are carrying out and what policies are being conducted by the governments of other states. They want to understand global politics. This is a new phase in the development of international life which we are presently observing.

For this reason it is necessary to explain this policy to the peoples and, so far as one is able to understand, the representatives of the U.S. Administration are afraid of appearing before the world public forum with an account of their true position, because

it will not be approved by the international public, and because the main thing about this position is not that it is impossible to prohibit nuclear tests because it is impossible to monitor them or because they are necessary for verifying [proverka] the reliability of nuclear warheads — all this is a lie which has already been proved to be such and hypocrisy.

The main thing is that they need nuclear explosions in order to develop new forms of weapons, but that is not an argument, indeed it is not a popular position.

[Zholkver] With such an argument...

[Gremitskiy — interrupting] No one will accept it [word indistinct]. [passage omitted]

Message to AFL-CIO

PM161428 Moscow TRUD in Russian 13 Sep 86 p 1

["To Terminate Nuclear Tests. Message from the AUCCTU Presidium to the AFL-CIO Executive Council"--TRUD headline]

[Text] Esteemed colleagues!

We, members of the AUCCTU Presidium, address you, members of the AFL-CIO Executive Council, on a matter of exceptional importance.

As you know, the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests was recently extended once more, through 1 January 1987.

It is our profound belief that, if the United States were to join the moratorium, a fundamental and specific step would be made toward laying a real foundation for constructive Soviet-U.S. dialogue, for movement toward universal, balanced, and verifiable disarmament.

We call on you to use all your influence to help in the making of such a step by the United States.

Addressing this message to you, we emphasize that we are motivated by awareness of the urgent need to achieve termination of the fatally dangerous nuclear-missile confrontation, and to curb the arms race which diverts enormous resources away from satisfying working people's vital needs, before it becomes too late.

USSR and U.S. trade unions operate under conditions of different socioeconomic systems, and this predetermines the differences in their priorities and methods of upholding working people's interests. But these differences must not overshadow the common fundamental interests of our trade unions' members: They all share one home--the planet Earth--and it must be saved from the threat of nuclear destruction.

The threatening growth of military danger dictates the need to overcome the barriers of prejudice and alienation which have been artificially raised between working people and trade unions of our countries. A dialogue leading to mutual understanding--this, in our opinion, is the way to organize cooperation between USSR and U.S. trade unions in the interests of Soviet and American working people.

This is why we address this appeal to you and hope that the AFL-CIO Executive Council will raise its voice together with the international public, which demands the termination of nuclear tests and subsequent resolute measures to ensure lasting peace, peace without nuclear weapons.

Summit Prospects 'Not Rosy'

LD150750 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 14 Sep 86

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] Hello comrades! Autumn 1986 promises to be a time when some important matters will be cleared up. And right now, it seems to me, the position of various states in relation to major international problems is becoming increasingly clear. What is usually called the moment of truth is here. And this is linked, of course, to the extension of the Soviet moratorium and all the ideas and views that were expressed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his replies to the questions of the chief editor of the RUDE PRAVO paper. You understand, of course, that at the moment the question involves not only halting nuclear tests but all of the ideas and actions of the USSR that are aimed at smoothing our international relations. The moratorium is a logical link in the chain of these actions. In talking about these actions and these ideas, I primarily mean the Soviet program to scrap nuclear armaments before the end of the present century, and the program to scrap chemical weapons and the bases for their production. Of course, one has to keep in one's mind the proposal of socialist countries for a considerable reduction in conventional armaments in the vast zone from the Atlantic to the Urals as well as the bold ideas relating to the strengthening security and cooperation in the Asian and Pacific regions, and, undoubtedly, the joint proposal of the USSR and other socialist countries to create an all-embracing system of international security.

These proposals, in essence, do not, of course, bear the nature of an ultimatum; they are open for discussion. But they require a certain consideration. And here, for instance, the monotonous no to the Soviet proposals which they are indulging in to excess in Washington, or the simple declaration that Soviet ideas are propaganda, are working less and less frequently. And it was no accident that this summer U.S. President Reagan, in describing the Soviet proposals for curtailing the arms race, said that it would appear from these proposals that there was an opportunity for a sudden change for the better in the development of Soviet-U.S. relations, and he even called them ideas that signified a turning point.

But as for the actions of the United States, they are running directly counter to the words I mentioned of the U.S. President. What is more, this concerns the most recent actions. On 11 November [date as heard] the United States carried out the latest test of a nuclear device in the desert of the State of Nevada. This test was code-named Aleman. This is the 16th nuclear test that has been announced. But if one counts the unannounced nuclear tests in the United States as well, then this is the 20th nuclear explosion since the Soviet nuclear moratorium.

Of course, one has to turn one's attention to the fact that it is so obvious that the United States is now, in September, on the verge of very important events, striving to side step working out a mutually acceptable compromise on strategic offensive armaments. It is dodging a possible solution, both a broad one and an intermediate one, on medium-range nuclear armaments. And there is no sign of substantial changes in the U.S. position for the better, as far as other serious problems connected with limiting the arms race are concerned.

And therefore, for today — and one should be able to see things clearly here — one cannot call the prospects rosy. In the very next few days a meeting should be taking place between the Soviet minister of foreign affairs and Shultz, U.S. secretary of state. This meeting will show whether the United States is prepared to go to a Soviet-U.S. summit meeting that will really yield results. And on the threshold of these very substantial, very important and significant conversations, one has to see, of course, that the United States has at its disposal many opportunities for putting a brake on the process of reviving detente. And nonetheless the United States does not have the right to veto all issues relating to world politics. A great deal depends right now on the active stance of the whole of the world community and undoubtedly on the position of the Europeans, on their ability to speak independently and with self-reliance. This applies to the whole of Europe and, of course, to Western Europe — and without doubt to West Germany.

Defense Ministry Spokesman

PM171314 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 14 Sep 86 p 3

[Interview with Colonel A.F. Kuznetsov, USSR Ministry of Defense spokesman, by SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA international observer G. Dadyants: "Once More About the Nevada Explosions" — no place or date of interview given; first paragraph is a SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA introduction]

[Text] The fact that the United States continues to conduct nuclear explosions in Nevada, despite the extension of the Soviet moratorium, causes universal indignation in the world. Colonel A.F. Kuznetsov, USSR Ministry of Defense spokesman, replies to SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA's questions about the nature and orientation of U.S. nuclear explosions.

[Dadyants] The attitude toward nuclear tests is now the touchstone of the real nature and orientation of any nuclear power's foreign policy. It is well known that the United States has carried out 20 nuclear explosions in Nevada while the Soviet unilateral moratorium has been effect. Initially they were justified by the alleged U.S. "lag behind" the Soviet Union, and later by the need to check the reliability of the existing nuclear arsenal. To what extent, Arlen Fedorovich, are these arguments convincing or, more correctly, unconvincing?

[Kuznetsov] The inconsistency of these arguments is proved by the facts. And the facts indicate that the United States leads in the number of nuclear tests, having carried out more of them than all the nuclear powers together. The Soviet Union started its test later than the United States, and by the day the moratorium was announced it had carried out one-third fewer tests. This is the second year in succession that the USSR has not carried out any nuclear explosions altogether. The gap in the United States' favor has thus widened further still. Let us turn to

figures. By the beginning of the year, according to data from the Swedish Defense Institute, the United States had carried out 807 nuclear tests against the Soviet Union's 563. These figures fit in well with data from London Institute of Strategic Studies. Nor have they been disputed in the United States. So, where is the "lag" of the United States?

The second argument is also inconsistent. Full-scale nuclear tests are by no means necessary for reassurance regarding the reliability of the existing nuclear arsenal. The reliability of nuclear ammunition is basically determined by their nonnuclear components, which can be effectively checked by methods of "nondestructive" monitoring. For more than 10 years now, in accordance with the existing 1974 treaty, the USSR and the United States have not carried out any tests of nuclear devices with the yield in excess of 150 kilotons. Are they not, therefore, managing without testing by means of explosions the reliability of ammunition whose yield exceeds this "threshold?" After all, this ammunition constitutes the bulk of the sides' arsenals.

What all of Washington's "arguments" have in common is a desire to justify its refusal to terminate nuclear explosions. But it does not and cannot have any convincing arguments to this end since the termination of tests is a vital necessity.

[Dadyants] If existing types of nuclear arms do not necessarily have to be checked by means of destructive explosions, this means that the tests in Nevada pursue the goal of creating new charges. What are the Americans working out in Nevada? What is the real nature and purpose of their nuclear explosions?

[Kuznetsov] The nature and purpose of the explosions carried out at the U.S. testing range in Nevada leave no doubt that they are aimed not at checking the reliability of the existing nuclear arsenal but at the development [razrabotka] of quite a wide range of new types of nuclear weapons. The U.S. press itself reports that the Pentagon is testing nuclear charge devices [zaryadnyye ustroystva] of warheads [boyegolovka] for the new MX ICBM which is currently undergoing flight tests, the Midgetman missile which is another new type of ICBM, and the submarine-launched Trident-2 missile; of warheads [boyevaya chast] for a new generation of strategic cruise missiles; and of more effective operational-tactical missiles and artillery, including neutron ammunition. A significant place in the U.S. nuclear test program is occupied by experiments for the purpose of creating [sozdaniye] so-called "third generation" nuclear weapons."

[Dadyants] The press, including the U.S. press, notes that some nuclear explosions in Nevada are designed for the implementation of the "star wars" program. As a rule, nuclear-pumped lasers are mentioned in the same breath. Are there any other types of nuclear weapons for "star wars" being worked out in the United States?

[Kuznetsov] It is known from foreign press reports that the United States is carrying out work within the "star wars" program framework to create [sozdaniye] a new type of nuclear weapons whose principle of operation is based on the transformation of energy particles emitted during explosion into a powerful guided stream of electromagnetic radiation, high-energy charged and neutral particles, or small-mass strike elements. Such a stream can cover large distances in space and strike various targets, including ballistic missiles and their warheads in flight trajectory.

These and other design concepts of guided-action nuclear devices are being tested in the course of full-scale nuclear tests in Nevada.

[Dadyants] The Americans have carried out 20 nuclear explosions but have announced only 16. Four of the explosions were "secret." What exactly were they, and how did we succeed in detecting them?

[Kuznetsov] For a long time now people in the United States have preferred not to announce officially any low-yield tests carried out in loose "soft" ground which absorbs well the explosion energy. In other words, they prefer to keep silent about tests which, in their opinion, cannot be firmly identified by seismological means. Probably the tests about which you are asking were of that kind. But the potential of seismological means is substantially greater now. Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that national technical means for monitoring nuclear explosions both in the United States and in the Soviet Union are not limited to just seismological apparatus.

[Dadyants] Our newspaper's readers ask: Does the silence at Soviet testing ranges not jeopardize our security while tests of U.S. nuclear weapons continue in Nevada? How can we answer them?

[Kuznetsov] Of course, the refusal to carry out nuclear explosions cannot fail to affect the state of nuclear programs, and we halted their implementation as of 6 August 1985. With no tests of nuclear weapons, their qualitative improvement has been frozen.

The Soviet Union took this step because it wanted to use the power of example to influence the stance of other nuclear states, primarily the United States, so that the nuclear arms race would be halted forever and a practical step taken in the cause of nuclear disarmament.

It is, of course, impossible to advance on this path in isolation and into infinity. They are certain limits beyond which we cannot risk our own security and the security of our allies. As M.S. Gorbachev emphasized, the country's security is our sacred cause. This must be clear to everyone.

U.S. 'Politicking' Hit

PM171021 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Sep 86 First Edition p 4

[V. Falin article: "Politics and Politicking"]

[Text] There has been total silence at Soviet nuclear test ranges for 14 months. Explosions have been rumbling constantly at U.S. test ranges for 14 months. The U.S. Administration refuses to join in the Soviet "propaganda," as it terms the moratorium introduced by the USSR in summer 1985 and extended four times since then. That is how they operate -- they besmirch the ending of nuclear weapons tests and brand it a "deception" which is allegedly diverting attention away from matters in hand, while the continuation of American experiments with nuclear weapons is presented as a "contribution" to the efforts to curb the arms race.

Absurd, you say. Of course it is. But it is impossible to prove the unprovable without crucifying the truth. And the truth is being violated. All the more since this is a customary occupation for Washington.

Let us recall the reaction of U.S. leaders to the Soviet unilateral moratorium of 1958. Moscow is dealing in "propaganda," was the claim. The "perfidious Russians"

were planning to put the West in a detrimental position and ensnare it. The U.S. leaders claimed this as they tested new types of nuclear weapons with unprecedented intensity for that period. The Americans conducted more than 50 explosions that went unanswered at the time. Among the arguments against an interim or open-ended test ban were "absence of trust," "complexity of verification [kontrol]," and "asymmetry" of the sides' arms. For good or ill, Washington told the public, the United States and its allies have adopted nuclear weapons as the foundation of their military strategy and they are thus obliged to improve them and maintain them in a state of combat readiness.

In short, the main features of an almost 30-year-old show are currently being repeated overseas. It is as if the decades had left no mark on the United States and had not prompted the powers that be to even ponder whether it was worth multiplying their mistakes and sticking stubbornly to their delusions.

The tests in the late fifties and early sixties initiated nuclear rivalry under water, raised the missile race to its current levels, and paved the way for the creation [sozdaniye] of many other arms systems that have made world peace so fragile. Everyone's peace of mind was lost. And nothing was added to the security of the United States itself.

For D. Eisenhower the abandoning of experimental nuclear explosions was tantamount to abandoning intercontinental weapons and the gamble on U.S. military superiority. The general-turned-President was not prepared to take a loftier view than his entourage, who were infected with nuclear fever. He merely branded them as the military-industrial complex. But what is in the mind of the present head of the administration? What visions would he regret or find hard to abandon? Revering his great trump card of "unpredictability," R. Reagan is in no hurry to show his hand. He keeps changing his mind depending on the prevailing fads on the Potomac at any specific time. There's no room for boredom.

When, however, it is not an individual but the policy of an entire state that is "unpredictable" it is no laughing matter. Political "unpredictability" is akin to willfulness and arbitrariness. How will it be possible to agree on anything if the "unpredictable" United States tomorrow eschews the commitments it adopts today whether with or without a pretext? But you will be told without batting an eyelid to take the Americans as you find them. You don't like them? Push off. The United States will get by without friends or partners.

This is a blatant anachronism. But entirely consonant with the neoglobalism logic. Those who intend to string the entire world along find friends a burden. Give them servants, retainers, and yes-men. They still adhere to the Old Testament interpretation of policy which V. Dal described in his famous "Dictionary" as: "The views, intentions, and aims of a sovereign, known to few people, and his mode of action that often obscures the same." So as to always have a free hand in everything.

The President never goes into the what, where, and when of matters, leaving that to his secretaries and advisers. They make no secret of the fact that references to verification [kontrol] and the need to test old charges from time to time or to "catch up" the Soviet Union -- which is allegedly far ahead -- and so forth, are a banal smoke screen. It is used as a cover to milk the taxpayers. A smog of information clouds the horizon, stopping the "man in the street" from getting his bearings. At least it is meant to.

What do they talk about in their own circle? Let us turn to Congress protocols. There one can discover, for instance, authoritative testimony by Pentagon representatives to the effect that the United States is by no means behind the USSR. These representatives are concerned not about how to catch up with the other side but how to overtake it.

Many people, however, are well aware that Congress is not the place where the U.S. military-industrial complex goes to lobby. Tongues are really loosened when soul mates drink warming cocktails without any outsiders present. Or when they sit down to carve up the budget cake. It is then that it comes to light that it is not well-rehearsed tests that are taking place at the Nevada range but experiments with half a dozen of the latest types of nuclear weapons at the very least. In addition they measure the capability and potential for exploiting the energy generated during an explosion for use in fundamentally new military systems.

Beam weapons are one of the reasearch avenues, and by no means the only one. Nonetheless, the program to create [sozdaniye] a beam weapon is seen as a critically important component in the "Strategic Defense Initiative" program. In the event of failure in this area the downfall of SDI as a whole is predicted. But since a nuclear-pumped laser cannot be built without explosions, the test moratorium gets a categorical "thumbs-down." Nuclear laser technology is still in its infancy. It will take a great deal of time and many nuclear experiments before it will be possible to ascertain whether the idea is feasible. How many explosions are planned? Various figures are given — ranging from several dozen to hundreds.

M.S. Gorbachev drew particular attention to the fact that weapons suitable for the practical waging of nuclear war are being developed during the tests. It is clear from materials that have been made public that underground explosions are being used to check the survivability of communications and homing devices and instruments for targeting nuclear charges themselves under real war conditions, as well as to check how the accepted norms and constructive decisions in terms of means of passive defense, including ways of overcoming that defense, conform with new knowledge that has been acquired. Furthermore, considerable effort is being put into miniaturizing nuclear charges and making them lighter so as to obtain greater accuracy and range with the same yield from available launch vehicles. Finally, spheres are being sought for making effective military use of devices working on transuranic elements.

According to statements by staffers at U.S. nuclear laboratories, the catalog of models for the military use of the atom is as inexhaustible as the atom itself. Everything depends on orders and the amount of funds granted by the government. A phase shift measured in billionths of a second can turn one nuclear process into a quite different one. Instead of strike energy the weapon radiates neutrons or other elementary particles. There is truly endless scope for seeking even greater evil, as if what has already been found is not enough.

Even a summary or fleeting acquaintance with the agenda for the experiments that have taken place in Nevada or are still planned leaves no doubt: The people there are not just preparing for war, they are carefully forging and nurturing a weapon which would revolutionize military matters for the second time in 50 years. The United States miscalculated in its first stab at world domination. The nuclear monopoly turned out to be a venture with a short half-life. As a result the super potency [sverkhsil] left Washington in a dead end. Now an "absolute weapon" is being invented, which is meant to bring its possessor absolute power. It may be for a moment, but a moment is long enough to carry out what they have in mind.

No, the moratorium does not boil down to abandoning the nuclear arms race. [as published] It is not only weapons that are being tested in Nevada. The test range is also assessing and verifying the latest U.S. military concepts and conducting tests on the peoples' readiness to oppose Washington's imperial lust.

Consequently, ending tests is a military-technical problem which is to a great extent of key importance for solving the broader task of nuclear disarmament as specifically posed in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January 1986 statement. But it is also a political, legal, and moral problem.

It is political because mankind cannot and must not be hostage to any "unpredictability." International relations are not a continuation of domestic American upheavals and the infighting among U.S. monopolies. The peoples are justified in demanding clarity. They have had their fill of declarations. They need peaceful actions.

Ending tests is a legal problem, primarily in the sense that the United States, the USSR, and Britain are obliged by treaty to strive to ban experimental nuclear explosions and wind down rather than whip up the spirals of nuclear rivalry. The day is coming when Washington and London, too, will have to answer to more than 100 states for having undermined the nuclear nonproliferation treaty.

It is a moral problem because the planet has long been creaking under the burden of the weapons that have already been amassed. Soon there will not be enough room in Europe and a number of other regions to build additional mountains of arms and military hardware. It is time to stop before the irreparable happens. It is time to realize that each new system and weapon takes away part of the peoples' security and hope.

The duty of politics today is to turn the possible into the real, and to make the peoples' hopes a reality. This is directly contrary to the meat and drink of the politickers, who put a gloss of evil on everything. Things are too serious to allow people to knock the earth into a rash orbit. Common sense should suggest to all honest people where they stand at this crucial time.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1578

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET ARMY PAPER HITS FRG'S WOERNER REMARKS ON MORATORIUM

PM101359 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Sep 86 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel I. Voinov article: "Toeing the Line"]

[Text] FRG Defense Minister M. Woerner addressed journalists from the leading newspapers of NATO countries in Bonn the other day. The subject of his remarks was the Soviet Union's extension of the moratorium on nuclear explosion until 1 January 1987. The thrust of his remarks was militarist. The arguments were not his own, but American, and their correlation with the real facts which he cited was virtually nil.

Ignoring the international recognition and support for the USSR's new peace initiative, the leader of the FRG military department tried his utmost to find some way of justifying the U.S. Administration's latest hasty refusal to join in the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests. What did Mr Woerner tell the assembled journalists?

First he disconcerted his audience with "accurate" figures: In the last 15 years the USSR, he said, has carried out more than 315 nuclear explosions, and the United States 223. It is not known where Mr Woerner got these figures. But we would advise him to take a look at the well known figures from the Swedish Defense Institute. They show that throughout the years of nuclear tests there have been 810 nuclear explosions in the United States and 563 in the USSR. Mr Woerner could also have used the equally well known figures from the Stockholm Institute of Disarmament Problems: In the period from 1963 through 1970 the United States carried out 242 explosions and the USSR 85, that is, a ratio of 3 to 1 in favor of the United States. Nor did the speaker feel inclined to look at the latest figures: In 1985 the United States carried out around 20 explosions, while the USSR had carried out 9 explosions before the imposition of the unilateral moratorium 2 of them for peaceful purposes. Over the year of the Soviet moratorium the United States carried out 18 nuclear explosions. Woerner preferred to keep quiet about all these figures. Nor, of course, did he mention the official Soviet statement that 30 percent of all the USSR's nuclear explosions were carried out for peaceful purposes.

Woerner's second staggering (but not new) argument was that the USSR had supposedly completed the stage of modernization of its nuclear arms, and simply does not now need any nuclear tests. It is noteworthy that in expounding this "argument" the West German minister prudently avoided juggling with figures. Indeed, he openly cheated in citing the facts.

Talking about the modernization of the USSR and U.S. strategic arms, he recalled with difficulty only two American systems — the MX ICBM and the Pershing-2 medium-range ballistic missile, saying that nuclear tests have been carried out in the interests of

creating warheads for these. Let us remind Mr Woerner: Quite recently the United States tested improved nuclear warheads for the modernized Minuteman-3 ICMB, for the Trident-1 submarine ballistic missiles, and for the whole range of cruise missiles with every type of basing mode. Substantial groundwork was also done to provide nuclear warheads for the latest delivery vehicles, which include the Midgetman ICBM, Trident-2 submarine ballistic missiles, the SRAM-missile, and the second generation of cruise missiles.

One might ask Woerner: Where does he see a U.S. lag in relation to the USSR in the modernization of strategic arms? It is clear to any sensible person that there can be no question of a U.S. lag and that it is the United States which is continuing to act as initiator of the nuclear arms race.

Woerner made the quite absurd claim that the nuclear tests being carried out in the United States have nothing to do with the Strategic Defense Initiative program -- the so-called "star wars" program. You have to be very brave to set about refuting the irrefutable! After all, the very names of a number of the arms envisaged under the program, such as the nuclear-pumped laser systems, speak for themselves. They also show that in creating [sozdaniye] space weapons under the notorious SDI program you cannot do without nuclear devices, and therefore you cannot be covered by any kind of fig leaf, however hard yet another zealous supporter of American nuclear policy may try to do so.

The FRG defense minister lamented that the ending of nuclear explosions is not in itself a substitute for comprehensive nuclear arms reduction. That is, of course, a reasonable point -- true, it is no substitute. But it can and must act as the first major step along the path of eliminating nuclear arms. Those who seek to bundle together the questions of ending nuclear explosions and comprehensive nuclear disarmament apparently want neither the one nor the other.

The FRG defense minister's zeal in "arguing" for the U.S. refusal to join the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions gives rise to both indignation and a legitimate question. Have his friends across the ocean instructed him to act for them on behalf of the European allies? Or is it perhaps his own initiative, looking very much like the loyal execution of Washington's desires?

In any event, Mr Woerner has done the cause of the lessening of international tension a disservice. Turning the question of a nuclear test ban upside down, he is basically trying to put barriers in the path of nuclear disarmament.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: KAZAKHSTAN EXPERIMENT SHOWS MORATORIUM VERIFIABLE

PM171008 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Sep 86 First Edition p 3

[Special correspondent A. Borovik "Reportage from the Soviet Nuclear Testing Range in Kazakhstan": "At the Epicenter of Silence"]

[Text] Semipalatinsk-Karkaralinsk — An American political scientist remarked a few years ago that Ronald Reagan's presidency would go down in American history as "experimental." In the sense that various ultraconservative economic and political theories are being tested out in practice under it. Nevertheless, by an evil irony of fate, this prediction has now gained another, a sinister meaning: The United States has become undisputed champion in the sphere of testing nuclear charges. It has carried out 20 nuclear explosions in just the one single year of our moratorium.

Nuclear devices rumble deep underground in Nevada. But the detonator itself is installed in the White House. Official Washington rejects Soviet peace initiatives, one after another, with amazing speed. But this speed testifies not so much to the flexibility of political decisionmaking there as to the instant effect of the reflex of rejecting any disarmament measures.

A most acute shortage of logical arguments to justify the fact that the United States is not joining the Soviet unilateral moratorium has come to light in Washington now. The problem of verification [kontrol] and inspection [proverka] was dragged out yet again. "They want" M.S. Gorbachev noted in his replies to questions by RUDE PRAVO's chief editor, "to extend the life of the bankrupt argument that a nuclear test ban is supposedly impossible to verify [prokontrolirovat]. It is bankrupt primarily in the light of scientific successes." Eloquent evidence of this has already been provided by the very first results of the ongoing Soviet-U.S. experiment on the verification [kontrol] of the nonconduct of nuclear tests. Scientists carrying out the experiment in Kazakhstan, not far from the Soviet nuclear testing range, have registered explosions at the Nevada testing range. The accurate instruments captured seismic waves which traveled for 13 minutes through 14 time zones.

Soviet and U.S. seismologists are working in Karkaralinsk. One wing of the "Shakhter" rest home, situated on the shore of a picturesque mountain lake, has been placed at their disposal.

The noise level here is low, I was told by Feliks Semenovitch Tregub, senior scientific associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences Physics of the Earth Institute. This is why it is easy to isolate the effective signal. And the granite rocks which reach through to the surface are good conductors of underground impulses and waves of any origin.

Furthermore, Karkaralinsk is situated next to the Soviet nuclear testing range. This is the first time U.S. specialists have been given an opportunity to study seismo-geological conditions in this zone.

The experiment is now in its first stage. Surface seismographic stations are located around the testing range. They are equipped with highly sensitive instruments: Even people's steps are registered, let alone nuclear explosions!

In the course of the second stage instruments will be installed in wells to a depth of 60-70 meters. This will make it possible to reduce to a minimum any wind, rain, or other interference.

Once a week the U.S. specialists visit the observation stations and change tape recorder cassettes and power batteries. Each of the recording instruments sited here covers its own frequency band. Afterward these data are summed up by processing apparatus. A special recording device "reads" them off the magnetic tape at the laboratory. The deciphered information is stored in computer memory.

Successes in the seismology sphere, U.S. scientist David Chavez said, today make it possible to use national means to detect even low-yield nuclear explosions on foreign territory and distinguish them from distant earthquakes.

I hope, his colleague David Carrell added, that the results of the joint experiment will be used in the interests of disarmament.

Those who advocate a bilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions are persecuted in the United States, D. Chavez went on. As soon as it became known that I intended to travel to the USSR to take part in the Soviet-U.S. experiment, I was submerged in a stream of poisonous jokes and insults. An acquaintance of mine, with whom I had hitherto maintained normal contacts, came up to me and said in a deliberately loud voice for everyone to hear: "What is this people say, that you are on your way to your second home?!"

Unfortunately, D. Carrell remarked, to judge by everything, the Reagan administration not only does not intend to join the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions, but is striving in every possible way to do everything within its power to ensure that America gets used to the need to continue nuclear tests.

The Soviet scientific delegation which will travel to the U.S. nuclear testing range in Nevada 14 September will be headed by Igor Leonovich Nersesov, chief of the Seismology Department at the USSR Academy of Sciences Physics of the Earth Institute.

While in Nevada, I.L. Nersesov said, we will have to resolve tasks similar to the ones being performed here, close to the Semipalatinsk nuclear testing range. (paragraph continues)

In the very near future we will have to select three locations to drill wells near the Nevada testing range and install surface instruments. It is envisaged to hold a Soviet-U.S. conference in Colorado which will discuss questions concerning the continuation of our joint experiment. We plan on completing the drilling of the wells themselves by the beginning of next year. We hope that the Soviet-U.S. experiment will make it possible to take a major step along the path of improving seismic monitoring methods. U.S. scientists have been given a unique opportunity to "record" the Soviet moratorium in regions directly adjacent to our testing range. You have seen for yourself that seismic equipment is already operational here. But will USSR specialists be given similar opportunities and conditions in Nevada?

This was the question I asked when I telephoned Jim Boyer, U.S. Department of Energy spokesman in Nevada.

"USSR specialists in Nevada?" Boyer asked. "First I heard of it."

There is nothing amazing in this answer. The U.S. authorities and mass media have done their best to keep silent about the experiment. Or, more accurately, to silence it by nuclear rumblings in Nevada. It became clear that Mr Boyer is equally ignorant about his compatriots working at present near the Soviet testing range in Kazakhstan.

"Interesting, and what are they doing over there?" My transatlantic interlocutor said with skeptical curiosity.

I had to tell Mr Boyer briefly about the nature of the current experiment and the fact that U.S. scientists are "recording" the silence at our testing range and the explosions at the Nevada range. At the same time I asked the Department of Energy spokesman whether he had heard of the Soviet unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions.

"I have heard of the moratorium," Mr Boyer assured me. Nevertheless, he refused outright to tell me what he personally thinks about the importance of the large-scale Soviet initiative.

"My thinking is done in Washington," Boyer explained. "Here in Nevada we only execute their decisions. You know, we are outside politics...."

A rash statement: For the second year in succession the Nevada testing range has been at the very epicenter of politics. It is the Nevada range that shakes international relations. It is there that people are making vain attempts to undermine peace, stability, and the peoples' hope for disarmament. This is why every test in Nevada generates a mighty explosion of protest all over the world and in the United States itself.

"We do not pay any attention to these peace lobbyists," Washington's spokesman parried. "They really don't know what they want. There can be no more than about 300 of them in America. It is stupid to consider the viewpoint of a microscopic minority."

Minority? The latest opinion polls show that the overwhelming majority of Americans believe that the United States must join the moratorium. Authorities in 175 cities, counties, and states have signed a resolution demanding of President Reagan to join the Soviet Union's initiative. Residents of Alaska voted for a freeze on the nuclear arms race and a reduction of nuclear arsenals at a referendum held there.

A 58-percent majority also voted in favor of a demand to local authorities to aim for the introduction of a joint Soviet-U.S. moratorium on the deployment of nuclear weapon systems. Some 700 participants in a Peace March which started from Los Angeles adopted a 10-point action program. It contains, in particular, a call for a complete nuclear test ban on U.S. territory.

To put it briefly, by continuing the modernization of the nuclear potential, the Washington administration disregards the viewpoint of what is far from a minority of Americans. Moreover, every time the authorities respond with repressions to peaceful demonstrations by protesters. Specifically, a group of fighters for peace, protesting against the latest nuclear explosion in Nevada, were arrested quite recently. Does this mean that the U.S. freedom of speech does not extend to Nevada?

"Our democracy," Mr Boyer enunciated clearly, "extends to all states in the country without exception. We have set aside a special area for demonstrations here. It is forbidden to go beyond its boundary. Thus, we arrested them not for protesting but for going outside the area allocated for the purpose."

I asked:

"Is that area large?"

"200 meters by 200 meters. Exactly."

...Whatever you say, U.S. democracy is a handy thing. And the main point — it is compact: Just 200 meters by 200 meters!

/12858

CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR'S PETROSYANTS HOLDS GENEVA PRESS CONFERENCE ON MORATORIUM

LD151915 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1710 GMT 15 Sep 86

[Text] Geneva, 15 Sep (TASS) -- The issue of halting nuclear tests is a kind of a touchstone by which the foreign policies of all states, both nuclear and non-nuclear, are being tested at present, Academician Petrosyants, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Utilization of Atomic Energy, said at a press conference here today. Having extended for the fourth time the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions to 1 January 1987, the Soviet Union is creating favorable conditions for reaching a full and universal ban on nuclear weapons tests as a realistic measure for curbing the arms race and for disarmament.

A. Petrosyants stressed that the halting of tests constitutes today not a military-technical but a political problem. It is technically possible to ensure reliable registration of [registratsiya] even small explosions. This view is shared by a majority of scientists and specialists from all countries. The Soviet Union has already said that it is ready for monitoring, including on-site inspections.

Proceeding from this, the USSR has positively replied to the proposals of the "Delhi Six" to take part, together with experts of these countries, in resolving questions of monitoring a halt of nuclear tests in the USSR and the United States. The Soviet delegation has proposed to the U.S. side in Geneva to respond positively to this proposal. However, there is still no reply from the United States.

A. Petrosyants noted with regret that the U.S. side does not show efforts toward the necessary flexibility and compromise. As previously, U.S. representatives are pursuing a course toward the continuation of tests and not toward halting them and the corresponding monitoring.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

GORBACHEV FIELDS QUESTIONS ON TEST MORATORIUM

17 September

LD180254 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 17 September in the "Vremya" newscast carries a 25-minute video report on CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to Krasnodar Kray 17 September. The passages within quotation marks are recorded.

The announcer opens his report with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's arrival in Krasnodar, where he was met at the airport by Comrade Polozkov, first secretary of Krasnodar Kraykom, Comrade Shcherbak, chairman of the Kray Executive committee; and members of the Bureau of the Party Kraykom. On his way to Timashevskiy Rayon, Comrade Gorbachev stopped in Novotitarovskaya Village.

Gorbachev then addressed the crowd and subsequently fielded questions:

"[Man] "Tests, how will things go from here with atomic explosions?"

"[Gorbachev] For the time being, things will be the way I have said, and it was only a few days ago that I said it, you know, that we are still looking at the United States, so that when we reckon that there (?are none) there...

"[Man, interrupting] And if they agree to...

"[Gorbachev, interrupting] Then I shall tell you...(Gorbachev's words are drowned out as crowd breaks into laughter) What am I to do, you want to find out before everyone else! I approve of your interest, and it is correct that you are interested in foreign policy. This policy is needed by us, just as all peoples need it. In the first place, there is danger for everyone in conditions of nuclear weapons."

"As far as our policy is concerned, all the same we are still reckoning, you know, on what is even a natural instinct of people for self-preservation, if not on the political wisdom of the leaders; and now there is such a wave of pressure on those quarters that still want to continue the arms race, and it is growing. We will not be changing our policy. But that does not mean we will beg anyone (?in the world). It does not mean that we will start disarming unilaterally. That would be absurd. Maybe that is just what they want, to give us commands, to dictate to us -- but they cannot do it at present and we will not permit anyone to dictate to us. At the same time, we are in favor of talks and of disarmament -- and of good relations. We have a policy, we have a fine people, we have an enormous country with its resources, we have an enormous base on which we can build realistic plans and strive to (word indistinct)

them, and so peace is a benefit for us from this point of view as well. And we don't have to implement such a policy through military power, of plunder, plunder of other peoples -- No, we are doing everything depending on our own resources, and on the potential of our order, our system. So, we will pursue a confident and strong foreign policy. We won't make it (word indistinct), full of rows, it should be serious, just as it ought to be on the part of the Soviet Union, the first socialist state, an enormous state, and hence with enormous responsibilities. I wish you all the best.

18 September

LD182000 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 18 Sep 86

[Remarks by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee made during an 18 September walkabout in Revolution Square in Krasnodar Kray, in response to questions from unidentified members of the public -- recorded]

[Excerpt][Unidentified speaker] Mikhail Sergeyevich, we doctors, like no one else realize the consequences of any war, never mind a nuclear war. That is why it is becoming particularly disturbing now when we hear that nuclear tests are still going on in Nevada. What, in your view, are the prospects for Soviet-America relations in this question in the long term?

[Gorbachev] This is the most difficult struggle we are waging -- the struggle for peace. Previously, they explained away all their militaristic plans by many inventions, many distortions about the image of the Soviet Union and its foreign policy. First of all, there was this: The Soviet Union threatens to conquer the whole world; The Soviet Union is striving for military superiority; The Soviet Union is preparing to occupy the whole of West Europe; The Soviet Union wants to put its clutches on Africa, on Asia. However, you know, the image they depict -- this, as they call it, the Russian Bear, the Russian aggressor. Looking at you, it seems to me, surely you and I don't give such an impression?

[Unidentified speaker] [passage indistinct]

[Gorbachev] People, all our generations which have suffered through all that has happened in our country, and we are proud of it, although we can see all our problems and shortcomings. [sentence as heard] We have given so much effort and given our lives, surely we could not devise such insidious plans, terrifying plans, in regard to other peoples? Raisa Maksimovna and I have sometimes read Dostoyevskiy, and he said -- the words are there -- that it is, perhaps, the Russian heart, but I would say the heart of the Soviet people, that is the most open now to fraternity and unification.

We invite with our peaceful foreign policy to unite people in order to save life on our planet, and to prevent not only a nuclear war but also so that ecology does not destroy the lives of people. The world possesses resources to solve the problem of poverty, and especially to end the arms race. They say that every year 400 billion, or possibly 500-600 billion [currency not specified] are spent on the arms race; but to wipe out poverty as a priority task requires 100 billion, 200 billion. So, that means 1 year could be used if the funds are there to solve the question. So, we now -- and yes, they said something else -- the Soviet Union is against any kind of monitoring, you cannot get to them to agree, they don't observe agreements. You can see all these fabrications of theirs, they have been exposed. We have proposed such a policy in all directions, and it is difficult to argue that it is not peaceful, and difficult to deny.

People now do not want to believe that the Soviet Union is engaged in propaganda and that strives for war, and the more they travel here and get to know our Soviet people, the more they find them kind, peace-loving, hospitable, ordinary and open. In many American circles — one of our Doctors of Philology returned after lecturing in something like 22 universities, and American scientists and representatives of the American intelligentsia said that Russia today remains the last reservoir of spirituality. So, people are beginning to find out what sort of country we are, what sort of people we are, what we think, what our dreams are, and what we strive for.

This is what we are implementing in our foreign policy, and this is the strongest — the most progressive foreign policy must rest on a firm basis. This is the reality from which there is also no escape, but that I mean: a powerful economy, a cohesive people, and a strong defense. All this is in our hands. All that we have planned, we will do: This will solve all our tasks, domestic ones too, and will strengthen our foreign policy.

It is not easy to try to reach agreement with representatives of the militarist circles, but the American people and all other peoples also have an interest in peace.

That is where we proceed from, and we count on the fact that people understand well enough that we must preserve peace.

Yes, please.

[Unidentified speaker] We speak softly to people abroad. Do we perhaps speak too softly with them?

[Gorbachev] You know, this is how we conduct our principles: Conduct a firm policy, defend principles, those I have just spoken about, but do so in a constructive manner. One must show restraint [vyderzhka]. You know, it is not being soft — one must have firmness, restraint, and restraint is not softness. Let them make frantic moves, and they do make frantic moves now.

They dream up things, like time they let powers loose in order to wreck the thaw which had come about in Soviet-American relations. Then there was the Korean plane, you know, when the world also began to think about getting back to detente. Now they have raised the Daniloff affair, a spy who has been caught red-handed, who engaged in espionage matters. You have probably read all about it. He had been to many places, including not far from you. He engaged in these matters, close to the center. But they want to call this a run-of-the-mill affair, espionage is no run-of-the-mill business. Nevertheless, in comparison with all international policy, relations, this whole complicated business, this, of course, is a common event, but they have turned it around in such a way as to again damage and sow doubt in the Soviet Union's policy, to damage its image, the image which people, especially in the United States, were beginning to understand, and simply reap a harvest of hatred toward us.

So will we get nervous? We won't get nervous comrades. No, we won't. They will not provoke us. I understand that you want the Soviet Union to be strong and resolutely pursue its peace-loving policy. I understand you. It is a proper thing to wish for.

/12858

CSO: S200/1579

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS CITES U.S. PEACE GROUP ON TESTING PROGRAM

4 Sep Test Information

LD080723 Moscow TASS in English 0704 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow September 8 TASS -- The "American Peace Test" anti-war organisation has thoroughly examined the information in its possession, compared it to the news coming from other organisations and government agencies and announced that the United States had carried out a new nuclear weapons test at a test range in Nevada in the morning of September 4, says a dispatch carried by "PRAVDA" today.

A nuclear device was detonated in a deep vertical pit at square 19 and its yield was equal to an underground tremor measured 3.5 on the Richter Scale.

Under the "calendar" of the U.S. energy Department this explosion was staged as part of the secret military research conducted by the Los Alamos Atomic Laboratory in New Mexico, the test was agreed to be titled as "Galvestone".

So, the United States set off the 19th nuclear device after the Soviet Union had announced the unilateral moratorium on nuclear blasts, the correspondent writes.

As has already been noted on more than one occasion this year, there was no report on the test in mass media.

"PRAVDA"'s correspondent placed a long-distance call to Las Vegas where the "American Peace Test" is headquartered. The call was answered by Jesse Cox, the organisation's national coordinator.

She said that a news blackout imposed on all information relating to the developments at the nuclear test site in Nevada could perfectly be explained. The administration does not want the U.S. public to be reminded once more about the ongoing U.S. nuclear tests. She said the organisation was also forced to check its information through other channels, including sources in the energy department and other federal agencies.

Upcoming Tests

LD100628 Moscow TASS in English 0612 GMT 10 Sep 86

[Text] San Francisco September 10 TASS -- Representatives of the U.S. anti war movement report new nuclear tests planned by the Reagan administration. According to Jessie Cox, national coordinator of the American Peace Test Organization, the next test is scheduled for September 10. It was condemned "Alamon".

Another explosion of a nuclear device is to be conducted on September 26. Three more tests are scheduled for October. In December the U.S. is going to conduct the nuclear test similar to the "Mighty Oak" test conducted in April which resulted in a substantial leakage of radioactivity inside the underground test complex in Nevada.

IZVESTIYA Observer's Comments

LD082126 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1701 GMT 8 Sep 86

[Text] Moscow, 8 Sep (TASS) — Commenting on the latest, the 19th nuclear explosion carried out by the United States since our country declared a unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests, IZVESTIYA political observer Vikentiy Matveyev writes today:

The public and governments, advocating a halt to nuclear tests (and they are the overwhelming majority), will doubtless draw conclusions from what is happening to the Nevada desert. The indignant reaction in the world to the madness of the atom-makers is capable of trumping even the most thunderous explosions of the weapons being tested in Nevada.

The struggle goes on. It will intensify. "Our task now is to convince the U.S. people and those who represent them that a mutual Soviet-U.S. ban on nuclear explosions meets the interests of the United States and also the citizens of all states. We U.S. physicians, must convince our citizens that on this issue national patriotism and universal humanism fuse into a single powerful torrent," indicates a telegram by Bernard Lown, cochairman of the international movement "physicians of the World for the Prevention of a nuclear War," which was sent to M.S. Gorbachev following his 18 August statement on Soviet television.

According to the latest information, the IZVESTIYA observer goes on, 56 percent of the U.S. people support the idea of the United States joining the Soviet moratorium. And this is in spite of the unbridled campaign of intimidation of ordinary people which official propaganda is conducting in its attempts to paint a terrible mythical picture about what would allegedly happen if there were no more nuclear tests. There are two Americas. A United States of conscience and good will and a United States of the evil of militarism.

We believe in the wisdom of the U.S. people and of all mankind, Vikentiy Matveyev writes in conclusion. Time is not on the side of the atom-makers, no matter how much they may arm themselves against the demands of the millions. The Nevada explosions will not remove from the agenda the question on which the very existence of our planet depends. This is being realized more and more clearly by masses of people throughout all continents. And here lies the great strength of the peace-loving initiatives which are dictated by a sense of responsibility for the destiny of mankind.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW TV: 2 SEP PRESS CONFERENCE ON VERIFICATION TECHNIQUES

LDO22311 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1838 GMT 2 Sep 86

[Text] A press conference took place today of Soviet scientific experts on monitoring the cessation of nuclear tests. This is one of the most acute questions, which has been something of a stumbling-block in international politics for 20 years now, since the time of the 1963 treaty banning nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in space and under water. Is the problem of monitoring merely--a pretext or really a complicated scientific and technical problem of the present day?

Opening the press conference, Gerasimov, the head of the information directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, introduces the prominent Soviet scientists who are ready to reply to journalists' questions. They are: Academician Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Gokhberg, acting director of the Earth Physics Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Neresov, corresponding member of the Armenian Academy of Sciences; and Kokoshin, deputy director of the Institute of the USA and Canada of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

[Begin recording] [Velikhov] Today there really is an historic opportunity to quickly put an end to the testing of nuclear weapons once and for all. The cessation of nuclear tests is the central question, the question of creating a more stable world and of safeguarding stability and security in the process of the transition from the nuclear world to the non-nuclear world, as is stated in the 15 January 1986 proposal of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

As before, there exists the argument about it being difficult to verify today, with the existing methods, the fulfillment of an agreement on the complete banning of nuclear tests. It has to be said that this argument is today refuted by the unanimous opinion of the entire geophysical world community of Western and Soviet scientists and scientists from other countries. Arguments are put forward to the effect that tests can be conducted in remote space, behind the sun: Tests can be conducted of very small warheads dispatched there by means of a space apparatus. These arguments are absolutely far-fetched and we can also give you information about what we think of such kind of arguments. They say that it is possible to create very complicated technical devices which completely, so to speak,

eliminate the emission of acoustic or seismic waves caused by very small explosions. Again it can be said what kind of a monumental structure is necessary to create for this in order for this to be of some substantial significance and how easy these structures and their creation can be verified by other methods, by means of reconnaissance from space, etc.
[end recording]

There was a question from a GDR journalist.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified GDR journalist] Yevgeniy Pavlovich, you said that all the techniques exist. Can you state what techniques the Soviet Union has for precise monitoring and what techniques the United States has.

[Velikhov] The Belomorsk laboratory has put forward the thesis that theoretically it would be possible to conceal a nuclear test by creating a large underground hollow some place and by conducting tests in such a hollow. It must be said that in this case today we have at our disposal: Firstly, with the utilization of high-frequency methods we see that such a use of a hollow proves considerably less effective than if we use old types of seismic equipment. Changing over to higher frequencies on a scale of 30-40 Hertz, it turns out, makes it possible to detect substantially better the explosions which are carried out in hollows. But, apart from that, today, over these past 20 years, the system of surveillance from space of any activity being conducted in any country of the world has been substantially developed. And by means of the space system of surveillance, of national means, it is certainly possible to verify the fact itself of the creation of such a huge hollow, since work comparable with the work to create an Egyptian pyramid is necessary. For this reason, the creation of such a large system for the concealment of nuclear explosions lends itself wholly to verification by other methods.

[Gokhberg] The latest experiment which now is being held with our U.S. colleagues in Semipalatinsk is aimed at studying the finer details, that is, the seismic sounds, both of natural and artificial provenance, so as to separate out a useful signal from the background of these sounds with complete clarity, that is, that is increasing the quality, [corrects himself] improving the accuracy and quality of detection of the separation of the signal from the background of interference. Thus, even the smallest explosions will not go unnoticed. Naturally, everything about the diverse geological structures at the testing grounds can be learned by means of this experiment which is now being conducted by the Institute of Earth Physics of the Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Council for the Preservation of Natural Resources.

[Unidentified speaker] Bulgarian news agency. A month ago it was said at a press conference here that this fall Soviet seismographic equipment would be installed near the test site in Nevada. When will this be, and what is the attitude of the U.S. government?

[Neresov] During the talks on the conducting of analogous work in Nevada and in the Soviet Union an agreement was reached that work would begin in the Soviet Union in the area of Semipalatinsk, and a little later it would be got under way in the area of Nevada. At the present time, a trip by a Soviet delegation to the United States is proposed, where specific issues on the installation of equipment on the territory of Nevada will be discussed. At the present time two Soviet-U.S. stations are already in operation on our territory, and a third station is probably at this moment being assembled--as we are holding this press conference--and this for the moment is the first stage of work on the installation of surface equipment. A little later, in November, when borehole equipment will be ready, it will be installed in boreholes. Preparations for boreholes are now underway at the Semipalatinsk test site. In the United States we have to agree analogous questions and commence work, it would seem, somewhere around January-February 1987.

[Unidentified speaker] Czechoslovak news agency. What scientific significance for the development of fundamental research does the Soviet-U.S. experiment in Semipalatinsk have?

[Gokhberg] For working out methods not only of monitoring earthquakes but also for working out new methods of forecasting earthquakes, especially operative methods of forecasting which would enable the time of an approaching earthquake to be determined within hours, which is very important inasmuch as it would be possible to get the people away, switch off power systems, and the equipment which will be set up on the territory of the Soviet Union and on the territory of the United States will of course make it possible to speed up the time taken in solving such complex problems, for example, as these.

[Neresov] No less interesting, too, are the questions connected with the study of the structure of this region, with the aid of surface and body waves. One other task which emerges here is the study of the lines of Nevada and Semipalatinsk which are in the very deep parts of the earth, and the structure, peculiarities and time changes. Our earth is living all the time, and this experiment may show the nature of life on earth as of our planet as a whole.

[Unidentified speaker] Soviet television, the "Vremya" program. Please comment on the present objections by the Americans of a scientific-technical nature, so to speak against quickly joining in the moratorium.

[Velikhov] In a whole series of speeches by representatives of the official U.S. Administration--for example, there was a speech by U.S. Energy Secretary Herrington--Herrington put forward the completely--in my view--absurd idea that, it turns out, the main reason is that the United States wants to be certain about what the Soviet Union can achieve by creating and testing such weapons. The answer to this would seem to be very simple: Join in the moratorium immediately. The Soviet Union has not been testing anything up to now anyway, for a year. After that all nuclear

tests in the Soviet Union and the United States will be stopped. Then there'd be no reason to worry about what could be achieved by creating these third-generation weapons.

[Kokoshin] What Yevgeniy Pavlovich spoke about, the moratorium and a complete ban on all explosions, these are measures which can substantially restrict the development of those means which could be seen as a first-strike means, as a means of a disabling strike, as a compact, high-precision means which are designed, according to the plans of some U.S. theorists, as it were, to inflict surgical strikes, to conduct all kinds of exchanges, so to speak, which would lead, perhaps, to a total exchange and to the utter destruction of our civilization. So, the Soviet position with regard to a ban on nuclear explosions goes completely in line with our position whereby we have made the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and that our nuclear forces are nuclear forces for restraining war and not for waging war. And we are definitely in favor of halting, and then, so to speak, going below the threshold which has been achieved, and to halt the development of these nuclear arsenals. I would like to draw attention to yet another aspect of Soviet military thought and of Soviet military doctrine which is at odds with what we have on the other side of the ocean, the aspect of a limited nuclear war. It has been said clearly by some of our top military theorists and military commanders, and it is written down in our Military Encyclopedia, that we reject the idea of a limited nuclear war as unrealistic and very dangerous.

[Unidentified speaker] The (DANA) agency, Argentina. The leaders of the Delhi Six made a specific proposal for cooperation in implementing the monitoring of nuclear tests. In what form and at what level is such cooperation possible? Do you have ties with the scientists and scientific organizations in those countries, and will there be discussion of this issue at the Conference of the Nonaligned Countries?

[Neresov] The fact is that national means, although they are perfectly adequate to carry out monitoring on other countries' territories, can be stepped up by distributing additional monitoring stations over the whole territory of the globe.

[Velikhov] I would like to add specifically this. In May this year we invited representatives from the six countries, specifically Indian and Swedish scientists, to the seminar, the first seminar we had for scientific discussion of the possibility of cooperation with U.S. scientists, and they were present at our seminar, and so they were fully informed about the Soviet-U.S. cooperation. Then there were representatives of all the countries present at the forum, they took an active part in it and also discussed these problems. And so, Soviet scientists, the Soviet Union, are completely open to international cooperation and participation concerning development of facilities for reliable confirmation of a complete end to nuclear tests.

[Unidentified speaker] TASS news agency. Why did the Soviet side agree to the use of U.S. equipment in both cases for this experiment?

[Gokhberg] This decision was made at a joint conference of Soviet and American scientists. The use of a single type of apparatus immediately clears away a whole range of contentious questions. The point is that Soviet and U.S. apparatus have different degrees of sensitivity. Therefore, if both Soviet and U.S. apparatus were used it would have been necessary to compare this apparatus and calibrate it. At that time the U.S. apparatus was ready and we agreed to use it, all the more so since the geological conditions at the Semipalatinsk test site and the Nevada test site are different. Therefore, there are different apparatuses and different geological conditions. Thus, it would have been rather difficult to solve the task of isolating the signal against background interference.

[Gerasimov] I have here a question in connection with this. It is from TASS.

The question is now being discussed in the United States: Are the Russians not gaining more than the Americans from the joint experiment? What is your opinion?

[Gokhberg] Well, this question does not occur to scientists. The whole experience of our work with the Americans, with our colleagues, shows that everyone gains. In this case there is a gain for universal trust, for trust between our countries. It is considered that the U.S. colleagues have access to the holiest of holies--the Semipalatinsk test site--where Americans were not previously permitted; that they will have the opportunity to calibrate the entire seismic channel from Semipalatinsk to Nevada; that the Russians in this case are gaining more in political matters.

Well, I can cite--I cannot remember who said this, I think it was Paul Bodin--one of the participants in the experiment. When the U.S. apparatus was set up and a few days later our American colleagues registered an underground explosion in Nevada, they said that we, as engineers, as an engineer I am pleased that our apparatus is working well, that we have tested and proved it, but as a citizen I am ashamed that these waves are coming from the territory of the United States. Of course, we would like our scientists to hear silence both at the Semipalatinsk test site and at the Nevada test site.

[Gerasimov] I think that it will be earth physics, science, that gains most.

[Gokhberg] Science always gains.

[Unidentified speaker] The newspaper KOELNNISCHER ANZEIGER, FRG. Is it conceivable that there can be some explosions, some tests for military aims, whose strength is so low that it is impossible under current conditions to verify or to determine over a certain distance?

[Neresov] Explosions of up to one kiloton are easily detectable both by national means and even more so by the establishment of stations on the other's territory. We have rich experience, as does the West, in registering small charges. There is the well-known method of deep seismic sounding which is widely used in the USSR and in some Western countries by which explosions of two to three metric tons [repeats emphatically] metric tons can be registered at a distance of up to 1,000km--500 to 600km--and in individual cases, up to 1,000km. Therefore, (?existing) stations are capable of registering very small charges at quite great distances. A seismological bulletin issued in Britain constantly reports industrial explosions of 20 to 30 metric tons detected by the network of normal stations, not special detection stations. Therefore, these figures should show that it is possible to register and record very small charges, that is, at the level of industrial quarries and at various industrial establishments. To speak of the difficulty of detecting explosions of one kiloton as the Americans do when they raise the question is at the least extremely unwise in a scientific environment.

[Velikhov] I would like to add that, as I have already said, to create [sozdaniye] third generation weapons it is necessary to have tests of the order of a hundred kilotons or tens of kilotons. Judging from statistical analysis, it seems that to improve nuclear weapons, active use is made of tests in the 10 kiloton range. [end recording]

The questions of scientific and technical progress are closely linked with political questions. Journalists asked Andrey Afanasiyevich Kokoshin to elucidate this theme.

[Begin recording] [Kokoshin] Recently we were at a seminar in (?Harwich) where we were confronted with this position in its most naked form on the part of representatives of the Livermore Laboratory, or those of its sections that are working directly on the creation [sozdaniye] of new weapons systems. Their thesis, as it were, was that the frontiers of science are boundless and in particular that it was impossible to halt military-technological progress, and no matter what we say or think, all the same, new weapons systems will be created [sozdavat]; and it is important only to, at best, regulate this business in some way. But this line is being met with increasing incomprehension and opposition on the part of the broad public.

[Unidentified speaker] NHK, Japanese television. It is now being said that the installation of equipment in the USSR and the United States is cooperation between individual scientists, not governments, at government level. Are you undertaking measures to raise the level of cooperation in this field at government level?

[Velikhov] We are ready to cooperate with both governmental and non-governmental organizations in order to reach the right goals. If there are now some governmental organizations in the United States that are prepared to participate in this cooperation, please come forward, we

are always ready. We have not had any restrictions. We have never put the question in such a way that only non-governmental questions could cooperate. As far as I understand from the existing literature--but I cannot guarantee that this is so--it seems that there has not been any real permission from the U.S. Administration for scientists working in governmental organizations to participate in this cooperation. There has been no such permission. Therefore, there are certain restrictions in the United States. But we have never imposed such restrictions. If the National Academy of Sciences or any other organization is prepared to cooperate with us on this we are always open to this. [end recording]

/12858

CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

PRAVDA REPORTS ON LUGAR SOUTH PACIFIC TRIP

'Anti-Nuclear Feelings in Region'

PM091302 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Sep 86 First Edition p 5

[Aleksey Ivkin "Commentator's Column": "Opposite Effect"]

[Text] Another "government inspector" from Washington has arrived in the South Pacific. This time it is Richard Lugar, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. His trip begins in Australia. The senator set about lecturing to the Australians and the leaders of other countries in the region on how to combat the "Soviet threat." Washington's envoy does not like the package of Soviet peace proposals with regard to this part of the world. He even sees a "threat" in the USSR's purely peaceful cooperation in the fishing sphere with some of the island states here.

But Washington is particularly alarmed by the increasingly clear antinuclear feelings in this region. A noticeable manifestation of those feelings was provided in particular by the conclusion last year of the "Avarua treaty" on the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. Ten countries have signed this treaty and 4 have ratified it since the 17th session of the South Pacific forum held on Fiji recently. Whereas the USSR and PRC have clearly supported the nuclear-free zone being created here, the United States (plus Britain and France) have raised a large number of objections to it.

The Australian Government welcomed the Soviet Union's extension of the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions to the end of the year and supports the conclusion of a treaty on the complete cessation of nuclear tests. From the White House's viewpoint, Canberra is "not behaving as it should" toward New Zealand. The latter refused to allow U.S. ships armed with nuclear weapons into its ports and Australia, you see, is absolutely avoiding condemnation of it.

In Canberra Lugar again foisted on people the view that the South Pacific countries cannot do without the U.S. "nuclear umbrella." He declared that the nuclear-free zone treaty of 13 South Pacific forum countries is "illogical."

The United States has other reasons to be displeased. It has become accustomed to impudently exploiting fish stocks even in the coastal fisheries of the states in this region. This causes the latter great harm and they are acting in defense of their just economic interests. Washington is also angry at the heightened differences of opinion with Australia in the agricultural sphere.

In general terms, "government inspector" Lugar was clearly sent to lessen the negative impact of the course which the United States is stubbornly pursuing. But by all accounts his trip is not particularly successful.

New Zealand Ship Calls Policy

PM091549 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Sep 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent O. Skalkin report: "Unceremonious Visitor"]

[Text] Wellington, 4 Sep — For some time, or, to be more precise, since the time of the New Zealand Labor government's proclamation of its nuclear-free policy which closed the country's port to American nuclear ships, the United States has been conducting a ceaseless propaganda campaign against Wellington. The remarks, orchestrated from across the ocean, criticizing New Zealand policy often attain the pitch of psychological warfare, violating the norms of the customary relations between independent states. More and more frequently, official American representatives are going over the heads of the New Zealand government to appeal to the country's public.

That is how one can assess the statements made by Richard Lugar, chairman of the U.S. Senate International Relations Committee, who visited the New Zealand capital in recent days. Clearly abusing hospitality, the senator permitted himself to make flagrant attacks on D. Lange's government, thereby spurring on internal opposition to him. Thus the decision to turn the South Pacific into a nuclear-free zone, supported by New Zealand, was described by the senator as a "hare-brained scheme."

Nor did he waste the opportunity to talk about the notorious "Soviet threat." Since he did not and could not have any arguments to support this so-called thesis, Lugar resorted to malicious insinuations.

The American visitor's unceremonious attacks aroused indignation in many inhabitants of the country. A wave of commentaries and readers' letters protesting about this has reached the pages of the newspapers here.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

DANISH PARLIAMENTARIANS, SOVIET OFFICIALS DISCUSS KOLA PENINSULA

PM020750 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 28 Aug 86 p 2

[Carl Otto Brix dispatch: "Folketing Chairman in Soviet Union: No Debate on the Kola Peninsula"]

[Text] Moscow--The Soviet authorities are totally unreceptive to suggestions for talks on a link between the Nordic area as a nuclear-free zone and the Soviet military buildup on the Kola Peninsula.

This was made clear by leading political and military figures to the leadership of the Folketing, which yesterday held talks in the Kremlin. "It is mostly old-style Russians [gammelrussiske] we have met in our talks here," Folketing Chairman Svend Jakobsen said after yesterday's talks. However, after yesterday's talks he was most positive about the atmosphere in which the talks took place, but when the politicians touched on the Soviet Union's military interests there was no responsiveness.

One of the Defense Ministry's top officials, Vitaliy Ganzha, declared that the idea of the Nordic area as a nuclear-free zone is an excellent one, but there can be no suggestion of negotiations with the Soviet Union until the zone has been established.

The Folketing deputies were also told that the Western threat and the constant expansion on the part of NATO in northern Norway, for example, make the Soviet Union's measures necessary.

Those involved in yesterday's talks also included State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control Chairman Yuriy Izrael, who told the Danish guests that reactors 1 and 2 at Chernobyl will be started up again this fall. Reactor 3 will be subjected to some further investigations before it can be started up again. It was in reactor 4 that the catastrophe happened, and this reactor is now encased in concrete. Izrael did not think that a special agreement needs to be signed with Denmark providing for warnings in the event of a nuclear leak.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

CSSR: SEMIPALATINSK TEAM STATES NO NUCLEAR TESTS HELD

LD121814 Prague CTK in English 1309 GMT 12 Sep 86

[Text] Karkaralinsk, Kazakhstan, Sept 12 (CTK correspondent Vaclav Frank) -- U.S. and Soviet seismologists David Chavez and Vladislav Martynov, manning a scientific monitoring station at the Soviet test site near Semipalatinsk, agree that it can be stated with certainty that the Soviet Union is carrying out no tests of nuclear weapons at the site.

As a group of Czechoslovak journalists visited one of the monitoring points at Karkaralinsk today, they learned that scientists at the station had already obtained several hundred data on various natural seismic phenomena and industrial explosions. Though it is not the purpose of their measurements, they also registered two nuclear blasts made by the United States in Nevada on July 17 and 22. All readings are being processed by computers. As David Chavez, of Nevada University, stated, information obtained on the geological conditions near Semipalatinsk enables American scientists to additionally analyze readings of nuclear tests carried out in Semipalatinsk before the declaration of the Soviet moratorium, and thus see that the Soviet Union had not breached the agreement limiting the strength of underground nuclear blasts. The first stage of the Soviet-U.S. project to monitor nuclear explosions is culminating in Kazakhstan as readings from seismological equipment on the earth surface are being analyzed.

The Karkaralinsk station began to operate on July 12, and instruments now also work in Bayan-Aul in the Pavlodar region. Another station is to start working at Karasu near Semipalatinsk. Preparations are culminating for the second stage during which instruments will also work in 100 metres deep pits. Soviet specialists have already completed a pit at Karkaralinsk, and at the two remaining sites boring is to be finished by the end of September. Installation of the apparatuses, which will be brought by American experts, and their putting into operation is planned for October.

Karkaralinsk, Bayan-Aul and Karasu were jointly selected by U.S. and Soviet experts. All are within a 200 km distance from the Semipalatinsk testing ground. The Soviet-American experiment will continue similarly in the United States. On Monday, a group of Soviet experts led by Professor Igor Nersisov is leaving for the USA to select the sites for monitoring stations and discuss the details of installation of scientific apparatuses.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1575

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

JAPAN'S FOREIGN MINISTRY WELCOMES USSR TEST BAN EXTENSION

OW200609 Tokyo KYODO in English 0550 GMT 20 Aug 86

[Text] Tokyo, Aug. 20 KYODO -- Japan welcomes the recent Soviet announcement of an extension of its unilateral freeze on nuclear tests until next January 1, a senior Foreign Ministry official said Wednesday. But the official added, "the moratorium does not mean a final solution to a total nuclear test ban," and called on the United States and the Soviet Union to make further efforts to bring about a total ban on nuclear tests. "It will be necessary for the U.S. and the Soviets to begin taking actions toward a total test ban," the official said.

The official further stated Japan welcomed a recent meeting of U.S. and Soviet experts in Russia on nuclear tests, terming it a step forward towards a test ban. Japan hopes that similar meetings between the two countries will bring positive results, the official said.

The Soviets unilaterally declared its nuclear test moratorium on August 6 last year on the anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima in 1945. The latest extension is the fourth since then.

/8309

CSO: 5260/131

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW PRESS CONFERENCE: SECURITY, TEST BAN, SDI

LD112120 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1440 GMT 11 Sep 86

[Report by Andrey Ptashnikov on the 11 September news conference held at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Center, chaired by Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov, with Deputy Foreign Affairs Minister Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy, and USSR Foreign Ministry officials Valentin Vladimirovich Lozinskiy, Vsevolod Leonidovich Oleandrov, and Gleb Aleksandrovich Smirnov. Questions by correspondents are in vernacular with superimposed Russian translation.]

[Text] [Gerasimov] Esteemed comrades, ladies and gentlemen, there has been a Soviet Government decision confirming the delegation of the USSR to the 41st Session of the UN General Assembly that starts soon in New York. Heading the delegation is Comrade Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR minister of foreign affairs; Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy, deputy head of the Soviet delegation, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR; Valentin Vladimirovich Lozinskiy, Vsevolod Leonidovich Oleandrov and Gleb Aleksandrovich Smirnov, deputy members of the Soviet delegation and senior workers of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs have come to meet you today to discuss matters related to the forthcoming session of the UN General Assembly. Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy will have the first word. Please.

[Petrovskiy] Esteemed ladies and gentlemen, comrades. The 41st session of the UN General Assembly opens on 16 September in New York, the most representative gathering of states in the world. The Soviet Union is going to this session with a comprehensive program of practical action to remove the nuclear danger, to curb the arms race and preserve and strengthen universal peace. Our country, guided by the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, is putting forward to the world community new ideas and fresh approaches directed toward building a guaranteed peaceful future for all peoples of our planet, a future without wars or violence. We consider it exceptionally important that both the discussions and the decisions of the 41st UN General Assembly Session, which, as you know, is convening in the final stage of International Peace Year, should be marked by a new political way of thinking that is fit for the requirements of the nuclear and space era.

The proposal for the creation of a comprehensive system of international security which, as you know, a group of socialist countries, including the Soviet Union, has, in timely fashion, submitted for the examination of the forthcoming session, is an expression of such a new way of thinking. The implementation of this initiative would foster a refashioning, in a revolutionary nature, of the political awareness and modus operandi of states. The purpose of this initiative is to decisively end confrontation and the arms race, and unite the efforts of all states with the aim of creating a

system of peace characterized not only by the absence of war, but by ruling out the threat of an outbreak of war and reliably ensuring equal conditions of security for all in any sphere of international relations. The moratorium on all nuclear explosions are convincing evidence of the new and bold approach of the Soviet Union to international affairs. Being not a declaration, but action, the moratorium has become an inalienable political and military reality of the modern world.

We consider that the United Nations, by means of its collective authority, can and must promote a situation in which the renunciation of nuclear testing is translated from a political slogan into reality.

The Soviet Union wants the coming session of the UN General Assembly to provide an impetus for progress in the nuclear, chemical and all the other areas for limiting armaments and for disarmament under the strictest monitoring, including on-site verification in the necessary instances. We want the funds released in the process of disarmament to be directed exclusively to constructive purposes, including aid to the developing countries. We are also putting forward specific peaceful alternatives to military programs — the peaceful use of space, of nuclear power, and of chemical science. Our approach to the session is aimed entirely at honest, constructive, and responsible dialogue, at joint search for answers to burning questions in the interests of world security, trust, and international cooperation. The Soviet Union is fully determined to strive to see that in our complex and contradictory, but at the same time mutually dependent world, the United Nations becomes an important instrument for such a joint quest and becomes a genuine center for coordinating the actions of all states, as envisaged in its charter.

[Gerasimov] May we now have your questions, please?

[Correspondent] Polish radio and television. At the 40th UN General Assembly session on the initiative of the Soviet Union, the problem of international cooperation in the field of the peaceful utilization and conquest of space was included in the agenda. The unilateral moratorium is in force, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is proposing the creation of an international monitoring system for the conduct of nuclear explosions. What are you able to say in detail at present about the next stage, so to speak, in the USSR peace offensive at the 41st UN Session?

[Petrovskiy] The Soviet Union intends at this session to launch an extensive peace offensive. For this purpose we are armed both with a new political philosophy for survival and also with a platform of specific actions. This platform of specific actions encompasses virtually all spheres of international relations, including the political, military, economic and humanitarian spheres. The sense of this platform is that the time has come to go over from words and declarations to specific and really tangible deeds. And our unilateral moratorium on nuclear test, which has already surfaced several times, is in particular, as I have already said, an example of this approach — not a declaration but an action. We are also ready for action in other directions, linked with the strengthening of world security. It is exceptionally important that the UN General Assembly -- that unique, universal forum expressing the interests of the entire world community -- should create what I would call an appropriate international life. For this, it is necessary to totally renounce attempts to use this forum for purposes of confrontation, and set about coordinating action in all areas and drafting a common position.

[Question] Kobayashi, Japanese NHK television. Will the meeting between Shevardnadze and Shultz take place as planned? That is the first question. And the second question is: The Soviet Union has stated that the arrest of Daniloff should not affect mutual relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. In order to avoid any negative effect, what measures is the Soviet Union prepared to take?

[Petrovskiy] I must reply to the first question first. The Soviet Union's position is that the meeting planned for 19-20 September should take place on the set dates. On our side there is no obstacle to this meeting being held.

As to the Daniloff affair, our position is that we are not making Soviet-U.S. relations the hostage of such a case. You asked about the Daniloff case, and I would like to say to those correspondents present in this connection that the U.S. side, those who ought to know, know perfectly well that Daniloff is being called to account on the basis of the law. There is evidence and material for this.

I should also like to stress that the possibility of a settlement undoubtedly exists, and incidents of this kind in interstate relations, and in particular in Soviet-U.S. relations, should not hamper the development of those relations.

As to the Soviet side, I must say that we are doing everything possible to achieve this, and I can say that contact has been established with the appropriate and competent U.S. organizations, and everything now depends on the U.S. side. But, I beg you to understand me correctly, gentlemen and comrades: I would prefer not to go into detail as this would stoke up even more the already artificially whipped up hue-and-cry surrounding the Daniloff case.

Disarmament to us is above all a means of ruling out any possibility of material preparation for war, and of creating the peaceful conditions for the life of our people and for the life of the people of the entire planet. In particular our position is that the process of disarmament should be accompanied by the release of funds saved for purposes of development. And in this connection we consider that there are corresponding peaceful alternatives in all areas where the arms race and military programs exist.

Take space, for example. The United States is now doing their utmost to extend the arms race into space, and thus effectively draw the world into a new and far more dangerous spiral of the arms race. We, on the other hand, are putting forward an alternative to star wars, the alternative of making peaceful use of space. And this alternative is not mere words. It is a specific program, drawn up in three stages. You know, it was set out in our message to UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar. As a first stage, we considered it possible to convene an international conference at the beginning of the nineties to consider comprehensively this program of action for peaceful use of space, and set up a world space organization to coordinate the activities of other states.

[Ptashnikov] Next came a question from a correspondent for the U.S. television company CBS. He enquires about the goals being pursued by the Soviet side as it approached the meeting between Comrade Shevardnadze, the USSR minister of foreign affairs, and Shultz, the U.S. secretary of state.

[Petrovskiy] We consider such meetings important in as much as they not only provide, so to speak, a survey of the state of affairs. They also map out prospects for the future. For this reason I stress that this meeting is of great importance. Of late we

have had a whole series of meetings between experts. We consider that these meetings have been useful. I would say that we have checked the timing of our political watches in all areas. Here and there we have tried to clean up the clockwork mechanism a little, but I must say that we have not been able to achieve synchronization of our watches.

We consider that the plans involved in the Strategic Defense Initiative are, basically, plans for star wars. You well know the essence of these plans, which is to create a space shield — vain attempts, I would say, to effect a first nuclear strike with impunity. And the participation of this or that country, in particular Japan, certainly does not promote the interests of peace and disarmament, since the SDI program threatens to plunge us not only into an arms race, which would in this case be of an uncontrollable nature. It also threatens to increase the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war.

[Question] A question from NOVOYE VREMYA: On the subject of the Soviet peace offensive, I would like to hear your appraisal of the international reaction to the latest interview with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in RUDE PRAVO.

[Petrovskiy] Even today, even though only a little time has elapsed since Mikhail Sergeyevich's statement, we can say Mikhail Sergeyevich's statement on questions related to the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions has had a broad international echo. I think that the reaction to our statement on this matter now gives us grounds to speak of a kind of trial by moratorium, a test of maturity, the political maturity of states. Paraphrasing a well-known Russian aphorism, I think we may say: Tell me what you think of the moratorium, and I'll tell you who you are — friend or foe of the cause of peace.

In this connection a highly typical feature which is now emerging in international life is that the watershed in attitudes toward the Soviet moratorium runs not along any political, ideological or social framework. Rather it runs between those who have adopted stances of common sense and political realism, and those who are guided by ideas of force and count on force as the last resort in world affairs. I believe that there are, nonetheless, grounds for expecting good sense to tip the balance eventually, and that as a result of this general support for the idea of ending tests, the nuclear-free hour will at last draw nigh. [An abbreviated version of this press conference was also carried by Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1445 GMT on 11 September 1986.]

/12858

CSO: 5200/1576

RELATED ISSUES

AUSTRIA'S VRANITZKY WRITES TO GORBACHEV ON ARMS ISSUES, SDI

AU181015 Vienna NEUE KRONEN ZEITUNG in German 16 Aug 86 pp 2-3

["Exclusive" report by Kurt Seinitz]

[Text] Vienna/Moscow — Last Wednesday, 13 August, Chancellor Vranitzky sent a letter to Kremlin leader Gorbachev, thus answering a confidential Gorbachev message of 14 July. The exchange of letters between the two heads of government deals with the tug-of-war in disarmament between the two superpowers and the verification and supervision of proposed disarmament agreements.

President Reagan in particular insists on "on-site" verification and supervision. In this connection an interesting idea for a compromise has emerged before the CSCE conference, which will start in Vienna this fall: The four neutral European states — Austria, Switzerland, Sweden, and Finland — could conduct such verifications of troop and arms reductions on site as a new version of the "Four in the Jeep," so to speak.

Vranitzky now sent his answer to Gorbachev: "Austria welcomes with particular satisfaction the fact that this year developments have occurred which make it appear more probable that the questions of adequate verification, resulting in connection with disarmament agreements, can be solved in a satisfactory manner. Austria believes that neutral states can play a special useful role in this area and is ready to accept such tasks if it is asked to do so."

Concerning the arms race of the superpowers, Vranitzky's letter stressed Austria's point of view that a worldwide peace can be maintained only in case of a balance of armaments at the lowest possible military level.

Without expressly naming Reagan's SDI project, the chancellor clearly speaks against unilateral armament initiatives of this kind: "In Austria's opinion, it is urgently necessary to avoid everything that would lead to unilateral steps which will then result in autonomous armament measures by the other side. Austria welcomed your proposal for a fixation (festschreiben) of the ABM Treaty for a specified period as an important contribution to finding a solution by means of negotiations."

In his six-page letter to Gorbachev, Vranitzky extends Austria's concerns about the danger of nuclear radiation from the neighborhood and to the nuclear arms stockpiled in Austria's neighboring countries.

Everyone in Austria is aware of the fact that our permanently neutral state is located in the middle between the two strongest military alliances in world history. It is understandable that the Austrian people are particularly interested in eliminating nuclear arms deployed in our immediate neighborhood."

/8309

CSO: 5200/2771

RELATED ISSUES

FRG DISARMAMENT OFFICIAL HOLDS TALKS WITH GDR'S FISCHER

LD101745 Hamburg DPA in German 1540 GMT 10 Sep 86

[Excerpt] East Berlin 10 Sep (DPA) — Within the framework of the consultations between the two German states on disarmament questions, the disarmament representative of the Federal Government, Ambassador Friedrich Ruth, had talks in East Berlin today with GDR Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer and Ambassador Ernst Krabatsch, director of the Basic Questions and Planning Main Department in the Foreign Ministry.

The meetings between Ruth and Krabatsch, who last met in Bonn in February, are part of the Federal Republic's dialogue with Warsaw Pact states on arms control issues. In the talk with Fischer, who was the first to receive Ruth, there had been no new points of view, it stated. In this connection, it was noted that Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher and Minister in the Chancellor's Office Wolfgang Schauble had spoken with Krabatsch in the previous round.

In today's exchange of views — the fifth meeting between Ruth and Krabatsch — the present efforts toward arms control, including the topics being dealt with by the United States and the Soviet Union and in particular the state of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence Building and Disarmament in Europe, were discussed. The Stockholm conference consultations are to end next week. Particular importance is attached to its results with regard to further developments in the efforts for conventional arms control in Europe. (passage omitted)

/8309

CSO: 5200/2772

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S ARBATOV EXPLAINS NEW SECURITY POLICY

AU091724 Sofia TRUD in Bulgarian 3 Sep 86 pp 1, 3

[Interview with Academician Georgiy Arbatov, director of the United States and Canada Institute at the USSR Academy of Sciences, given to Nina Vasilkova, Moscow correspondent for NOVOSTI — date and place not given]

[Text] [Vasilkova] Georgiy Arkadeyevich, you participated in the discussion and preparation of the basic party documents determining the strategic line in our country's development for the period up to 2000. How would you describe the essential character and the innovations in the USSR's foreign policy line?

[Arbatov] The Soviet Union not only came out with numerous peaceful proposals, but it also addressed the peoples of the world with a document of a basically new character — a document which is purposeful, which represents a specific and comprehensive concept for ensuring international security.

The search itself carried out in the USSR in this direction led to the conclusion that the very approach to the problems and to our way of thinking should be changed. Is it not true that the search itself, unfortunately, is destined to lag behind the rapidly changing facts of reality? We in the Soviet Union not only called upon others to overcome this gap between the real world and the idea of it, but we began to adapt facts to the new requirements, above all in the military and political spheres. In drawing a conclusion from this process, we proceeded with our initiatives. They reflect our present idea of the threat, our idea about how mankind should live today in order to avoid a nuclear disaster. I will recall the basic aspects of our proposals.

They stem above all from the fact that the security problem, in its very essence, is a political problem and that it cannot be resolved by military technical means alone. The appearance of new types of weapons has transformed military power into a genuine boomerang, also affecting those who have recourse to it. It has become evident that not the arms race but disarmament alone can strengthen security.

We are guided by the fact that in the nuclear century we cannot build security at the expense of or to the detriment of the other side. This security can only be mutual — if we mean relations between the USSR and the United States — or common, if we are talking about the entire international situation. Security today can only mean security for all. In our century the issue is: equal danger and equal security — for everyone.

We think that it is necessary to become aware of the truth that the world has become very complicated. The world is in a process of constant change which no one is able to stop; no one can establish a status quo. The legitimate interests of almost 200 states meet one another on the world scene. These are both political and economic interests. If the national interests of the individual states are not respected, no real security can exist. At the same time, all states and peoples in our world, despite the existing differences which divide them, must learn to respect not only their interests but also the interests of the others. They must learn the science and art of peaceful coexistence, the science and art of practicing restraint and self-control, as well as tact on the international scene. They must learn how to live in a civilized manner, under the conditions of relations and cooperation based on equal rights.

In other words, the contemporary world has become very small and vulnerable; it does not permit any wars and any policy of strength. We must resolutely and once and for all put an end to the outdated ideas and actions which throughout many centuries relied on the possibility and admissibility of waging wars and of practicing the arms race.

All proposals of the Soviet Union are based on the aforementioned thoughts. Their nuts and bolts consist in the program of gradual nuclear disarmament and full banning of nuclear weapons, submitted by Mikhail Gorbachev in his declaration of 15 January 1986. This Soviet initiative is not an ultimatum but a potential basis for serious negotiations, a basis for future dialogue. We are also ready, in the course of the negotiations, to analyze most carefully all proposals of other countries.

[Vasilkova] What can you say about the reaction to the Soviet proposals in the West, especially as regards the United States?

[Arbatov] A rather strange development occurred in this case. Broad public opinion, including that in the United States, supports our ideas. However, in the government circles of certain states, especially in the U.S. Administration, our proposals evoked mostly chaos and confusion. Many Western politicians assumed a "defensive position" because they were obviously not prepared for such a course of events. The Soviet proposals seemed somewhat too drastic to them.

For example, Hans Dietrich Genscher, the FRG minister of foreign affairs. He declared that West Germany is also against nuclear arms, but that they should be reduced in several stages. As if we proposed to eliminate these weapons tomorrow.... The question is not to gradually or immediately ban nuclear weapons — the question is whether to reduce or increase the nuclear potential. This is the main point of our controversy between the USSR and the United States, between East and West. The goal of our foreign policy is to accelerate the process of negotiations on the question of disarmament, because the speed with which the negotiations are being conducted is fatally lagging behind the speed of the arms race. However, we are not capable of accomplishing this by ourselves. Gus Hall, the leader of the American Communists, recalled the old truth: "It takes two to tango." This also applies to the negotiations, which cannot be conducted unilaterally.

[Vasilkova] Can you say in which direction Soviet-American relations will further develop?

[Arbatov] We are well aware of the fact that it is not easy to obtain a positive answer from the United States, from the West as a whole. The approaches of the USSR and of the United States to international affairs differ considerably from one another. On

the one side we have the quest for mutually acceptable solutions, the effort to take into consideration the interests of the other side and to find a way out of the nuclear deadlock for humanity, a way out which avoids universal holocaust. To put it briefly, this is a flexible, unmistakable, and I would even say, masterful approach, based on the awareness of reality and understanding for all implications, as well as for all new elements introduced into the existing situation. The situation is such that, as one of my American friends said, if a nuclear war should erupt, it will scarcely be possible to distinguish the ashes of capitalism from those of socialism. On the other hand, we are disappointed with the selection of partial truths made by the United States, "truths", such as the saying: "If you want peace you should be prepared for war", or "the winner is above law", or "strength is the most convincing argument," and so forth. When you listen to such miserable arguments, which history has long since rejected, you feel sorry for this great nation: What kind of short-sighted policy it is conducting?

Nevertheless, I do not think that we should make final pronouncements yet on the mood of the present U.S. Administration. It has frequently changed and I hope that this is possible even today. Recent public opinion polls in the United States suggest a drastic reduction in support for the military programs and expenditures of the White House. This is also confirmed by the numerous amendments to the military budget which were introduced by Congress and which seriously irritated the White House and the Pentagon. This is fully understandable, if we take into account the fact that military expenditures increasingly affect the vital interests of the people. The growing dissatisfaction with the general policy of the administration in the United States is an ever-intensifying process, in my opinion.

[Vasilkova] In your opinion, is there hope that a new Soviet-American summit meeting may take place?

[Arbatov] You see, there is a wise saying: "Politics is the art of the possible." We base our policy not upon illusions, but upon real possibilities. For a long time there was no possibility for us to conduct a dialogue with the United States. This dialogue is being actively conducted today. If both sides desire it, the meeting will not only take place, but will also produce concrete results. We must work for this opportunity. We think that a number of serious problems must be resolved at the meeting, problems connected with the main issues of USSR-U.S. relations. We have not given up hope in this respect.

The survival of mankind, and its prosperity and progress, as well as fully feasible goals. The necessary and obligatory pre-condition for transforming this goal into reality is to ensure relations of peaceful coexistence and cooperation. I would even say that there is no other alternative for mankind. The point is, we must either proceed along this path, or civilization will disappear from the face of the earth. We cannot, we have no right to choose the second alternative. Our common sense absolutely rejects this alternative.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1576

RELATED ISSUES

JAPAN REAFFIRMS NON-NUCLEAR POLICIES TO U.S.

OW160437 Tokyo KYODO in English 0406 GMT 16 Aug 86

[Text] Tokyo, Aug. 16 KYODO -- Foreign Minister Tadashi Kuranari reconfirmed to United States Ambassador to Japan Mike Mansfield Saturday that Japan refuses to introduce nuclear weapons to its territory, a Foreign Ministry official said. Kuranari reconfirmed the Japanese policy to the U.S. envoy after the U.S. notified Japan Thursday that the battleship New Jersey, which is capable of launching nuclear cruise missiles, will visit Sasebo port, Nagasaki Prefecture, between August 24 and September 2. Shore leave will be granted to the crew and the ship will take on supplies, the official said.

Kuranari reportedly told Mansfield that Japanese Diet members have expressed fear that the U.S. is introducing nuclear weapons to Japan, particularly by the 45,000-ton New Jersey which is equipped with launching pads for Tomahawk cruise missiles. The Japanese government should dispel any such fears in the event of the New Jersey's port call, Kuranari told the envoy. Kuranari said the Japanese people have a "special feeling" regarding nuclear weapons and that Japan has maintained and will maintain "three nonnuclear principles" prohibiting the production, possession or introduction into Japanese territory of nuclear weapons, the official said. Kuranari was also quoted as saying that if the U.S. asks for prior consent on introducing nuclear weapons, Japan will deal with the matter in accordance with the three principles and that Japan will handle the matter under the Japan-U.S. security treaty and related agreements.

Mansfield told Kuranari that he understands the Japanese stance and the Japanese people's special feeling toward nuclear weapons, the official said. The U.S. envoy also said it is U.S. policy neither to affirm nor deny the existence of nuclear weapons, adding that the U.S. Government will respect the Japan-U.S. security treaty and related agreements, the official said.

/8309

CSO: 5260/129

RELATED ISSUES

JAPAN: PLANNED 'NEW JERSEY' VISIT SPARKS CONTROVERSY

OW191315 Tokyo NHK Television Network in Japanese 1000 GMT 19 Aug 86

[Text] Referring to the "USS New Jersey's" scheduled port call, Kenji Taguchi of the JSP, at a meeting of the House of Representatives Committee on cabinet affairs today, asked if the Tomahawk missiles carried by the ship were equipped with nuclear warheads.

[Begin recording] [Taguchi] Has it been confirmed that no nuclear warheads are aboard the "New Jersey?"

[Gotoda, chief cabinet secretary] Inasmuch as there has been no request from the U.S. Government for any prior consultations on bringing in nuclear arms, we believe, on the basis of the relationship of mutual trust under the Japan-U.S. security treaty, that the U.S. Government -- that is, the "New Jersey" in this case -- will not be bringing in any nuclear weapons. [end recording]

Meanwhile, Fujii, director of the Foreign Ministry's North American Affairs Bureau, answering Taguchi's question on the possibility of the "New Jersey" making Sasebo its home port, said that he had heard of misgivings about this spreading among local residents, but added that he had not the slightest knowledge about any U.S. plan to make Sasebo a home port for the "New Jersey."

/8309

CSO: 5260/130

RELATED ISSUES

JAPAN: 'NEW JERSEY' ARRIVES FOR PORT CALL AMID PROTESTS

Labor, Peace Activists Protest

OW240440 Tokyo KYODO in English 0436 GMT 24 Aug 86

[Text] Sasebo, Nagasaki Pref., Aug. 24 KYODO -- U.S. battleship "New Jersey" sailed into the U.S. naval base here Sunday while thousands of demonstrators and a flotilla of small vessels protested the portcall for violating Japan's non-nuclear policy. The protestors, mostly labor unionists and peace activists, charged that the battleship is armed with nuclear-tipped Tomahawk cruise missiles in violation of Japan's policy of banning the introduction of nuclear weapons into the country.

It was the first visit to Japan by the 45,000-ton "New Jersey" after it was refitted and recommissioned in 1982. Built in 1943, the battleship took part in the bombardment of Okinawa during World War II. Apart from its 16-inch guns, the refitted "New Jersey" is also equipped with eight Tomahawk launchers. The Tomahawks are cruise missiles which can carry both conventional and nuclear warheads.

The battleship, accompanied by an oil tanker, dropped anchors at the Akasaki quay at 10:30 a.m., and the 1,500-member crew was welcomed to Sasebo by local authorities and representatives from the Defense Agency. Security was tight at Sasebo, both at sea and on land.

As the huge warship made its way into the Sasebo Bay, an armada of 47 fishing boats and small vessels crisscrossed nearby in protest. Bedecked with red, green and white banners, the protest boats blared out anti-American slogans but the high-pitched shouts were barely audible amid deafening din generated from ship engines and churning waves. The small vessels were kept from getting close to the towering "New Jersey" by 46 Maritime Safety patrol boats, which sailed alongside the warships.

On land, 3,600 riot police were mobilized to guard against possible guerrilla attacks by more than 500 leftwing radicals who had traveled to Sasebo, police said. Police said they arrested five demonstrators near the Sasebo railway station for squabbling with police during a protest march. The five were identified by police as members of a left-wing radical group called the "Senkiiryokawa-ha." The group, some 50 members strong, took out to the streets after a protest rally at a local park.

Some 600 labor unionists and peace activists staged rallies in the morning at Maebata Wharf, which overlooks the naval base across the Sasebo Bay. In the afternoon, another 14,000 protesters were to stage rallies and protest marches.

The "New Jersey" is part of a five-vessel flotilla which is on a nine-day visit to Japan for crew rest. Two other warships — the 15,540-ton nuclear-powered cruiser "Long Beach" and the 2,750-ton missile frigate "Thach" — docked at the U.S. naval base in Yokosuka, south of Tokyo, and the 5,770-ton destroyer "Merrill" berthed at Kure in Hiroshima Prefecture. Like the "New Jersey", those three smaller warships are also equipped with Tomahawk missiles. They form the main elements of the Seventh Fleet's surface attack group. Defense sources say the five warships are scheduled to join other Seventh Fleet vessels for a major naval exercise in the Sea of Japan after the crew rest in Japan.

During a press conference aboard the "New Jersey," Rear Adm. R.A.K. Taylor, the surface attack group commander, refused to comment whether the warships were carrying nuclear-armed Tomahawks. The admiral said U.S. policy is neither to confirm nor deny the existence of nuclear weapons aboard U.S. warships. He said the five warships were put into three different ports for the sake of crew rest, repair and maintenance. Taylor also would not say where his ships were heading after their stay in Japan.

'Calm' Returns 25 August

OW250459 Tokyo KYODO in English 0448 GMT 25 Aug 86

[Text] Sasebo, Nagasaki Pref., Aug. 25 KYODO — Calm returned to the port of Sasebo Monday after a day of rallies and demonstrations Sunday which greeted the arrival of the U.S. battleship "New Jersey." Protestors say the visit by the battleship, which is equipped with Tomahawk cruise missiles capable of being fitted with nuclear warheads, breaches the nonnuclear principles of Japan. Nagasaki prefectural police reduced their security force for the battleship's visit from 3,600 to 3,400 and are also considering reducing the security forces sent to assist them from other prefectures.

Capt. W.L. Glenn, captain of the 45,000-ton "New Jersey," and Rear Adm. R.A.K. Taylor, commander of the U.S. Seventh Fleet's surface attack group, paid a courtesy call on Sasebo Mayor Kumashi Kakehashi Monday morning.

The police said most radical elements and other demonstrators from other countries had left Sasebo by Sunday evening but a 24-hour alert for possible actions against the warship during its nine-day stay. Six patrol boats are on guard around Sasebo Port's Akazaki Pier where the "New Jersey" is berthed.

A peace group affiliated with the Japan Socialist Party and the General Council of Trade Unions of Japan (SONYO) is holding an "antinuclear peace panel exhibition" at a park in downtown Sasebo. Three peace activists from Kyoto began a sit-in in front of the Sasebo municipal office Monday morning to protest at the port call by the "New Jersey." One of them, housewife Machiko Yoshida, 48, said she plans to continue the sit-in alone from 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. from Tuesday through September 2 when the "New Jersey" is due to leave Sasebo Port.

/8309
CSO: 5260/132

- END -

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

OCTOBER 16, 1986